

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Speaker, when death came to Mr. MORGAN he was holding the position of ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary—the lawyers' committee—of the House, consisting of 21 members, a miniature legislative body within itself. Upon entering Congress I was assigned to that committee, and in that way was placed in right close contact with Mr. MORGAN.

My associations with Mr. MORGAN on the great committee I have mentioned, as also in this Chamber, were very pleasant.

Mr. MORGAN zealously guarded the interests of farmers and of soldiers and lost no opportunity of defending the just rights of these worthy members of society. Mr. MORGAN was a live wire. Active rather than static—a potential force in formulating policies and shaping legislation.

Mr. MORGAN was a gentleman of culture and great erudition and walked uprightly before God and man. What may be said of him here to-day are not the words of flattery, for such can not "soothe the dull cold ear of death"; but they are the testimony of associates and friends, to be recorded as a memorial to a worthy fellow Member, in order that history may teach to all the lesson of his excellent life.

It is to be regretted that Mr. MORGAN could not have lived longer to serve his great State, for he was yet in his prime, but concerning this we will have to accept the philosophy of Cicero. In *Friendship and Old Age*, Cicero tells us that we should not mourn for the dead; that to his mind—

nothing whatever seems of long duration in which there is any end. For when that time arrives, then the time which has passed has flowed away; that only remains which you have secured by virtue and right conduct. Hours, indeed, depart from us, and days and months and years; nor does past time ever return. * * * Whatever time is assigned to each to live, with that he ought to be content.

Cicero believed that the souls of men were immortal, and therefore it mattered not how long a man should dwell upon the earth.

Judge MORGAN was of a deeply religious nature, and when the time came for him to begin his journey and as he entered the valley leading to the undiscovered land, united with Bryant in saying:

He who, from zone to zone,
Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight
In the long way that I must tread alone,
Will lead my steps aright.

Mr. SWINDALL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I consider it an honor to pay my tribute to the high character, integrity, and public service of the late Dick T. MORGAN, as well as his service to humanity in the rôle of a private citizen.

He served the people of his native State of Indiana as a member of the lower house of the legislature in the session of 1880-81. He was appointed registrar of the United States land office at Woodward, Okla., by President Roosevelt, in 1904. It was at the last date I became personally acquainted with him. At the time of his appointment there was a large amount of business being transacted at the United States land office at Woodward, Okla. Testimony had been taken in a number of contest cases in which the former registrar and receiver had not had time to render opinions. Mr. MORGAN immediately got busy and decided these cases. His service was so efficient in this work that when the Alva and Woodward land offices were consolidated in 1908, and by reason thereof Mr. MORGAN lost his position as registrar of the Woodward land office, the members of his party decided he should be a candidate for Congress from the second district of the State of Oklahoma. He consented to enter the primary and was nominated and elected and has served the people of the State as Representative in Congress from the second and eighth congressional districts since that time to the date of his death. He would have been the nominee of his party in 1920 and would have been elected by the largest majority he ever received had it not been for his untimely death. Had he lived to fill his term he would have honestly and faithfully served his district, State, and Nation for a period of 12 years.

During his residence in Woodward he and I lived within two blocks of each other and were warm personal and political friends. In 1912 it was the view of the Democrats and Republicans that the member of the Republican State committee must be nominated at the primary election. I was induced by Mr. MORGAN and a number of his friends to become a candidate for State committeeman and was selected at the primary election. Since that time I have taken an active part in each of his congressional campaigns and became well acquainted with his work as a Member of Congress and his private life as a citizen of our State. Politically he was a Republican, but after his election he was truly a representative of the people of his

district, State, and Nation. He did not carry politics into his high office as a Member of Congress, but at all times honestly, faithfully, and fearlessly endeavored to represent the citizens of the Nation to the best of his knowledge, skill, and understanding. I feel that this is the highest compliment that may be paid to my good friend and late fellow-townsmen. I appreciate very much the kind remarks of his many friends expressed upon the floor of this House to-day, and I may say that the kind eulogies in memory of his efficient service will be appreciated by every citizen of his district, as well as the citizens of the State and the Nation who informed themselves upon his public career.

In politics, as in private life, he believed in dealing fairly and justly with every citizen. He would respond as promptly to the call of the most humble citizen of his State as he would to the most powerful and influential member of his own party. During the World War he advocated such measures as were proposed by the President to make the American Army the most efficient army engaged in the great struggle for the rights of humanity. After the armistice was signed, he worked diligently to secure the discharge of all soldiers engaged in the agricultural enterprise in order that they might return to their homes and carry on their former avocations. He was also a strong advocate of the soldiers' land bill, which, in substance, later became one of the component parts of the bill for the relief of American soldiers engaged in the World War. He did this purely from the standpoint of an American citizen and statesman and in justice to our noble soldiers who so valiantly stood by the American Government in the greatest struggle ever known to the world.

Mr. MORGAN was a Christian gentleman. He was a member of the Christian Church and led a truly pure and Christian life. We believe that from what we know of him, and from what his many friends have said concerning him, that his life, public and private, may be expressed in the beautiful lines of the poet who said:

Do your work as well,
Both the unseen and the seen,
Make the house where God may dwell
Beautiful, entire, and clean.

It was his wish that he might be buried at Oklahoma City, the home of his only son, Porter H. Morgan; so in accordance with his wishes, at Oklahoma City on July 10, 1920, we consigned his dust to dust, and commended his spirit to God who gave it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In accordance with the resolution previously adopted the House stands adjourned.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Monday, February 28, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

MONDAY, February 28, 1921.

(Legislative day of Thursday, February 24, 1921.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gooding	McLean	Smith, Md.
Ball	Gore	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Gronna	Moses	Smoot
Borah	Hale	Myers	Spencer
Brandeggee	Harris	Nelson	Stanley
Calder	Harrison	New	Sterling
Capper	Heflin	Norris	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Henderson	Overman	Swanson
Colt	Hitchcock	Owen	Thomas
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Townsend
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Trammell
Curtis	Kellogg	Philips	Underwood
Dial	Kendrick	Pittman	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kenyon	Poinexter	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Keyes	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	King	Ransdell	Warren
Fernald	Kirby	Reed	Watson
Fletcher	Knox	Robinson	Williams
France	La Follette	Sheppard	Willis
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Shields	Wolcott
Gay	Lodge	Simmons	
Gerry	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.	
Glass	McKellar	Smith, Ga.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

GIFT OF SILVER VASE TO VICE PRESIDENT.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Sixty-sixth Congress is drawing to its close. For eight years, sir, you have presided over the deliberations of the Senate. By the passage of time and the processes of election you will leave the chair on the 4th of March.

It is the desire of the Senate to manifest in something more than a formal resolution the personal regret which all of us feel at the fact that we are about to separate. Separation in the brief life allotted to us here always has an element of sadness. But I desire—and I am sure I am speaking in behalf of all the Senators—to express to you the affection that we feel for you, our sense of your unvarying kindness to each one of us, the thoroughly human way in which you have always dealt with us individually, and we wish that you should take with you a symbol of our feelings. We know that you are not going to forget us, any more than we shall forget you and all our many pleasant relations over a period of great strain and great events; but we have felt that some gift, an inanimate object, might serve from time to time, when your eye rested upon it, to remind you of the feeling that we all have and the regret that we all feel personally that the hour of parting is so close at hand.

In behalf of the Senate—and I know that the leader on the other side will express the same feeling—we all desire to give you every good wish in the future, and that you should know that you take with you our affection, our hopes for your happiness and prosperity, and, although I need not express a hope on this, that you will not forget the many days we have spent together in the service of our common and beloved country.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the fates called you to preside over the Senate of the United States in the most tumultuous and dangerous era of the world's affairs, and I may say, I think, without contradiction, in a time when matters of moment before the Senate were as great, if not greater, than those that ever came before the Senate previously in the history of the country.

You served your country well in this trying era. You leave here with the respect and confidence of your colleagues who have served with you in the Senate. The gift that your friends here ask you to take home with you is not presented to you for its intrinsic value; we ask you to take this token home with you as a reminder always of the love and the friendship and the confidence of the men who served with you during this great era embracing your incumbency of the office of Vice President of the United States.

May happiness, success, and good fortune be with you always is the wish of the friends you leave behind you.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators, I can hardly be expected to voice the emotions of this moment. I do not forget the day when I came to you, when, as a tumultuous Indiana politician I looked askance upon the Senate of the United States, and when, I fear, the Senate of the United States wondered what the American people meant in such a choice as they had made.

This has been a great school for me; a school of my old age. It has taught me that there is not a man in this body who is not a double man; a man who has a brain that he devotes exclusively to the determination of the great problems which from time to time confront the deliberations of this body; but underneath that man of brain there is another man, a man of heart; and I have found in the eight years of deliberations with the United States Senate that—

The heart is wiser than the intellect
And works with swifter hands and surer feet
Toward wise conclusions.

There was a time in my life when I thought I would like to be a great man; when I hoped that in some mysterious way I could listen to the plaudits of the multitudes and plume myself upon the accomplishment of some great purpose for mankind. I have learned here to long for that no longer; to have but one supreme desire; that as the days are coming closer and closer when I shall put aside the purple curtains of twilight and go out I know not whither; but I hope without fear I can so live the days to come as to keep what I think I have—the friendship of the Senators of the United States. Others may have what they will, but for me—may I call you brethren?—but for me, brethren, I shall not forget your generosity, your patience, your overlooking of the faults and foibles of a too often ill-tempered man. I shall not forget the friendly handclasp nor the generous elbow touch of humanity. I shall go remembering all these generous years and be content in the thought that if I can not have greatness I may yet retain friendship.

I shall take this, your generous gift, with me out to Indiana. The people of Indiana will think it is a loving cup. They will

imagine that it has been presented to me as a memorial of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. [Laughter.] If it be such, it will meet with the approval of most of the people of Indiana, but it will be a source of sincere regret to some, I know, that you did not fill it up. [Laughter.]

Senators, as all evil comes to an end, so all good times cease. Ours has ended. May the man who takes my place learn to know that beneath the bitterness of partisan controversy in the United States Senate there is a warm, human, loving heart that seeks, after all, only friendship and good will. I thank you. [Prolonged applause on the floor and in the galleries, Senators rising in their places.]

REFERENCE OF INDIAN CLAIMS TO THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Order of Business 781, being the bill (H. R. 10105) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate claims which the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, and Seminole Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes. The bill is a local one relating to Oklahoma, and I do not think it will take over two minutes to pass it. If it leads to any debate, I will withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if it is understood that an amendment which I intend to propose shall be agreed to—and I understand the amendment is agreeable to those who are interested in the proposed legislation—I shall have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 6, after the words "with the," to strike out "Choctaw, Chickasaw"; and, in line 9, after the word "said," to strike out "Choctaw, Chickasaw," so as to read:

That jurisdiction be, and is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate any and all claims arising under or growing out of any treaty stipulation or agreement of the United States with the Cherokee, Creek, or Seminole Indian Nations or Tribes, or any act of Congress, in relation to Indian affairs, which said Cherokee, Creek, or Seminole Indian Nations or Tribes may have against the United States, and which claims have not heretofore been determined or adjudicated.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in view of an agreement which has been reached amongst Senators concerning the matter, I ask the Senate to disagree to the amendment striking out the words "Choctaw, Chickasaw."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 2, line 7, after the words "United States," to insert the following proviso:

Provided further, however, That the provisions of this act shall not be construed to confer jurisdiction upon the court to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate any balance claimed to be due on the so-called Loyal Creek claim, or any amount claimed to be due to equalize allotments among members of the Five Civilized Tribes.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to offer an amendment, which I understand is agreeable to the parties interested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, after line 17, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

Mississippi Choctaws, so called, composed of all those certified Choctaw Indians and their descendants heretofore enrolled, a roll thereof to be made up under the direction of the court, to whom privileges were granted and guaranteed under any provision of the treaty of 1830, east or west of the Mississippi River as the case may be, acting together or separately as one or two bodies as they may be advised, shall have the status of a nation or tribe for all purposes under this act, judgment in such case to be rendered in favor of the individual claimant to whom same equitably belongs, in whole or part; *Provided, That the petition or petitions on their part shall be verified by the attorney or attorneys employed by them.*

Mr. GORE. I shall offer no objection to the amendment, but will allow it to go to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The amendment reported by the committee to amend the title was rejected.

PANAMA RAILROAD CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Seventy-first Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Co. for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1920.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
28 February, 1921.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. McNARY presented a certificate of the governor of Oregon certifying to the election of ROBERT N. STANFIELD as a United States Senator for the term beginning March 4, 1921, which was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF OREGON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

(Certificate of election.)

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

Know ye that it appearing from the official canvass of the vote cast at the general election held within and for the State of Oregon on Tuesday, the 24 day of November, A. D. 1920, that ROBERT N. STANFIELD, of Multnomah County, State of Oregon, received the highest number of votes cast for the office of United States Senator in Congress at said general election: Now, therefore,

I, W. T. Vinton, governor of the State of Oregon, by virtue of the authority vested in me under the laws of the State of Oregon, do hereby grant this certificate of election and declare said ROBERT N. STANFIELD, of Multnomah County, State of Oregon, to be duly elected to the office of United States Senator in Congress of the State of Oregon for the term of six years, beginning March 4, A. D. 1921.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Oregon to be hereunto affixed.

Done at the capitol, at Salem, Oreg., this 29th day of November, A. D. 1920.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

W. T. VINTON, Governor.

SAM R. KOZER,
Secretary of State.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hemstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. CRAMTON, and Mr. Sisson were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

H. R. 13944. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 14063. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15543) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes; that it had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 29, 30, 34, 37, 38, 46, 59, 63, 76, 80, 95, 98, 99, and 114 to the bill; that it had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 82, 112, and 113, and had agreed to each thereof with an amendment; and that it insisted on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 58.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had appointed, additional to those previously appointed, Mr. SLEMP and Mr. DENT as managers of the conference on the part of the House on the bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 7775. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 9281. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy,

and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 10515. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 11554. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 14461. An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. TOWNSEND (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented memorials of sundry citizens of Highland Park, Milan, Detroit, Pontiac, Grand Rapids, Royal Oak, Houghton, Benton Harbor, Owosso, Otsego, Plymouth, Vassar, and Marquette, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented telegrams in the nature of petitions of sundry American Legion Posts of Pontiac, Port Huron, Houghton, Saginaw, Escanaba, Adrian, Grand Rapids, Ortonville, St. Clair, Royal Oak, Stanton, Alpena, Lapeer, Wakefield, Jackson, Ishpeming, Frankenmuth, Boyne City, Lake Linden, Capac, Ludington, St. Louis, Jackson, Mackinaw City, Lake Odessa, Battle Creek, Portland, Ypsilanti, Grand Haven, Ann Arbor, Sault Ste. Marie, Tecumseh, and Marcellus, all in the State of Michigan, favoring the passage of the so-called adjusted compensation bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a resolution of Phillips-Elliott-Hodges Post, No. 22, American Legion, of Saginaw, Mich., protesting against remission of the war debts of France and the Allies, and also a loan of \$2,000,000,000 to Germany for the reestablishment of trade relations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a petition of the pastor and trustees of Zions Evangelical Church, of Mount Clemens, Mich., protesting against the presence and action of French colonial troops in the occupied zone of the Rhine, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a petition of sundry members of Frenchtown Grange, No. 749, of Monroe, Mich., favoring the passage of the truth-in-fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BALL presented memorials of Anna G. Walsh and Mrs. William Green, of Wilmington, Del., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CAPPER presented a telegram in the nature of a petition of the Southern Association of Dyers and Cleaners, of Birmingham, Ala., favoring the passage of the truth-in-fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Somerset County Pomona Grange, No. 39, of the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit gambling in grain products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Park County, Mont., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation increasing the tariff duty on wrapper tobacco, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MOSES presented a resolution of the Retail Jewelers' Association of Manchester, N. H., favoring a turnover sales tax of 1 per cent, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PHIPPS presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 1, by Senators Fairfield, King, and Bashor.

To the Hon. Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America; the Hon. Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War; the Congress of the United States, and more particularly to the Members of Congress from Colorado, the General Assembly of the State of Colorado respectfully represents:

Whereas we are informed that one Frank Zimmer, a citizen of this State, together with a companion in arms, both of whom are veterans of the American Expeditionary Forces in the World War, and who reenlisted for service in Germany, are now under arrest by German authorities at Eberbach, Germany, charged with assault as the result of their attempt to arrest Grover C. Bergdoll, the wealthy draft evader and slacker; and

Whereas the flagrant manner in which said Bergdoll has used his money and influence to flaunt his disrespect of American authority and military regulations before the world has focused the attention of our citizens and all the civilized world upon his case, making his recapture and punishment a test of our sovereign powers and our efficiency in law enforcement; and

Whereas said Bergdoll is a criminal and a fugitive from justice, and efforts to bring him to justice should be applauded and rewarded rather than disapproved and punished: Now, therefore,

Your memorialists, the senate and house of representatives of the Twenty-third General Assembly of the State of Colorado, do respectfully request and urge that the United States Government take such action as may be found necessary to secure the release of those veterans and patriots who are now detained by German authority upon German soil and to secure their safe return to American authority.

It is directed that this memorial be entered in the records of the general assembly, and that copies hereof be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each of the Members of Congress from Colorado.

EARL COOLEY,
President of the Senate.
N. N. MCLEAN,
Secretary of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 5041) to amend section 206 (C) of an act entitled "An act to provide for the termination of Federal control of railroads and systems of transportation; to provide for the settlement of disputes between carriers and their employees; to further amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, as amended; and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. DIAL:

A bill (S. 5042) to require judges appointed under authority of the United States to devote their entire time to the duties of a judge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 5043) to aid in the reclamation of lands in the bed of Winnemucca Lake, in the State of Nevada, to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of South Carolina:

A bill (S. 5044) granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River near Haileys Ferry, and between the counties of Anderson, S. C., and Hart, Ga.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MCLEAN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 263) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to designate depositories of public moneys in foreign countries and in the Territories and insular possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

STREET RAILWAYS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. POMERENE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 4973) to amend the provisions of an act relating to certain railway corporations owning or operating street railways in the District of Columbia, approved June 5, 1905, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 822) thereon.

HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS, WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES.

Mr. REED submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 467), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding \$1.25 per printed page to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee or any subcommittee thereof may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on February 27, 1921, approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 4436. An act to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act;

S. 4682. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended;

S. 4683. An act to amend section 11 (m) of the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the acts approved September 7, 1916, and March 3, 1919;

S. 4897. An act to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended; and

S. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to exempt the New York State Barge Canal from the provisions of the transportation act, 1920, and for other purposes.

EMERGENCY TARIFF—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the emergency tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The reading clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 10, 23, and 24.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, and 21, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "35"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert a comma and the following: "except rice cleaned for use in the manufacture of canned foods, on which the rate of duty shall be 1 cent per pound"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert a semicolon and the following: "olive, 40 cents per gallon in bulk, 50 cents per gallon in containers of less than 5 gallons"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"19. Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75°, one and sixteen one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound, and for every additional degree shown by the polariscope test, four one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound additional, and fractions of a degree in proportion; molasses testing not above 40°, 24 per cent ad valorem; testing above 40° and not above 56°, 3½ cents per gallon; testing above 56°, 7 cents per gallon; sugar drainings and sugar sweepings shall be subject to duty as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscope test."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"20. Butter, and substitutes therefor, 6 cents per pound."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"24. Wrapper tobacco, and filler tobacco when mixed or packed with more than 15 per cent of wrapper tobacco, and all leaf tobacco the product of two or more countries or dependencies when mixed or packed together, if unstemmed, \$2.35 per pound; if stemmed, \$3 per pound; filler tobacco not specially provided for in this section, if unstemmed, 35 cents per pound; if stemmed, 50 cents per pound.

"The term wrapper tobacco as used in this section means that quality of leaf tobacco which has the requisite color, texture, and burn, and is of sufficient size for cigar wrappers, and the term filler tobacco means all other leaf tobacco."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"25. Apples, 30 cents per bushel."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"26. Cherries in a raw state, preserved in brine or otherwise, 3 cents per pound."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"27. Olives, in solution, 25 cents per gallon; olives not in solution, 3 cents per pound."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "16 and 18"; and the Senate agree to the same.

BOIES PENROSE,
P. J. McCUMBER,
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. W. FORDNEY,
WM. R. GREEN,
NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,

Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, a very few changes have been made in the bill under the conference report. The first amendment is in relation to wheat, on which as the bill passed the Senate a duty of 40 cents a bushel was imposed. That has been reduced to 35 cents.

The proposed duty on olive oil has been reduced from 50 cents to 40 cents per gallon in bulk, and from 70 to 50 cents per gallon in containers of less than 5 gallons.

The duty on frozen meat has been made 2 cents.

On sugar the duty has been reduced to bring the rate down to not to exceed 2 cents per pound. I think that will make the rate \$1.60 per hundred on Cuban sugar.

The duty on butter has been reduced from 8 cents to 6 cents a pound, and the duty on apples has been changed so as to read "30 cents a bushel," the provision of the bill as passed by the Senate proposing a duty in reference to apples from Canada of 30 cents a box. All reference to Canada has been stricken out, so that the duty is 30 cents a bushel from any country.

As the bill passed the Senate a duty of 4 cents a pound was imposed on cherries. That has been reduced to 3 cents a pound.

The items I have mentioned substantially cover the changes made by the conference report.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to examine the report, but, as I understand, there was some change made in the proposed tariff on sugar as the bill passed the Senate. Will the Senator kindly explain what the reduction is now under the conference report?

Mr. McCUMBER. The rate on sugar is reduced so that Cuban sugar now will be taxed about \$1.60 a hundred, instead of 2 cents, and the reduction brings it down to 2 cents as the maximum amount per pound.

Mr. POMERENE. How much is that above the tariff under the present law?

Mr. McCUMBER. The tariff under the present law, I believe, is about 1 cent.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator whether it is true, according to his understanding, that sugar has gone up within the past week 2 cents a pound?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not kept track of the market reports.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand that is the case; that the market has already advanced 2 cents in contemplation of this proposed act.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate long in a discussion of the conference report upon the emergency tariff bill; but I think it would be dereliction in duty if this side of the Chamber should permit that report to come to a vote without further discussion.

The conference report makes some slight reductions in the duties imposed in the bill as it passed the Senate; but these reductions are only slight, and, in the main, the bill is just what it was when the Senate passed it. Practically all of the Senate amendments were retained. There was, however, one very striking and very significant exception. The conferees struck out bodily the Senate amendment imposing a duty of 15 per cent upon hides. This, I believe, is the only Senate amendment that was stricken from the bill altogether.

The duty of 15 per cent on hides is one of the few duties imposed in this bill as it passed the Senate which might have been of considerable help to the stock raisers of this country, provided always the packers had not seen fit to rob them of such benefits as otherwise would have accrued from that duty. I say this duty might have been of considerable value to the stock raisers of the country because the importations of hides in the past few months—I might say during the past six months—have been far greater, relatively speaking, than the importations of any of the other commodities upon which duties are imposed in this measure.

It is well understood that the value of a duty upon any product depends upon whether or not there are importations of that product and upon the volume of those importations. Therefore, I say that this duty which was stricken out by the conferees because of the large importations of the commodity affected might have been of real value to the farmers.

Why under these circumstances was it stricken out? I have been unable to ascertain, except for the reason, as I understand it, that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] desired a duty upon manufactured leather to compensate its producers for the increased cost of their raw material, and in drawing his amendment, which was adopted by the Senate, he made a mistake, in that while he intended to increase the present duty upon manufactured leather, which is 30 per cent under existing law, to the extent of 10 per cent, thereby making that duty 40 per cent, he so drafted the amendment that it reduced the present duty from 30 per cent to 10 per cent. Because of that situation the conferees struck out both the Senate amendment and the House provision imposing a duty of 15 per cent on hides, which duty, as I say, might have been of material value to the stock raisers of the country.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, if I may ask the Senator a question, he does not desire the Senate to understand that this which he has mentioned was the only thing upon which the conferees acted in striking out this amendment?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; of course I would not go quite that far. There may have been some opposition to the duty on hides per se.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I give the reason, if the Senator was not there all the time? The principal reason urged by the House members was that the packers, who are also tanners, always bought their hides with the cattle, and of course there was no duty therefore upon the home hides, while the independent tanners must always buy their hides and import them, and that this would give an advantage to the packers in the matter of tanning their own hides. That was the principal reason insisted upon by the House members. I am not going into the argument as to the pros and cons of it, but I want the Senate to have a clear understanding of the two propositions that the House insisted upon as reasons for their objecting to the Senate amendment.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator. I yield because I think this is a very important matter.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I certainly agree with the Senator from North Carolina. It is a very important matter, and I should like to have anyone who is able to do so explain the difference between this duty upon hides, in its operation along the lines which have just been suggested by the Senator from North Dakota, and the duty upon wool.

When sheep are sold in the market, and bought by the packers, there is quite a recognition of the difference in value between the price of the pelt without the wool and with the wool, whether the fleece has been shorn or not. It seems to me that the principle in the one case is precisely the same as in the other. Everyone recognizes that the price of hides has much to do with the price of cattle, and especially that class of cattle which is known as tanners and which constitutes a very large proportion of the cattle which find their way into the general markets of the country.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. That was practically the position taken by the Senate conferees. They insisted that when the packer bought cattle he bought hide and all, and if hides were more valuable because of this protection he paid more for the cattle and paid more for the hide; therefore their reasons for rejecting it upon the ground that it placed an extra tax upon those who import it did not seem to us to be sound. Nevertheless they insisted, and with that insistence upon this proposition and their insistence upon the other proposition, just mentioned by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], it was necessary, in order to get an agreement, for a short period at least, that we leave out the hide proposition entirely.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. It seems to me, from a very cursory examination of the conference report, that in regard to leather the compensatory duty is going to the manufacturer, while in respect to hides that duty was not granted.

Mr. McCUMBER. There was much more insistence upon the other feature by the House conferees.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, this duty of 15 per cent on hides is practically everything this bill conceded to the cattle raisers of the country, some Senators, on this side of the Chamber, being allured by that provision of the bill probably more than by any other in it, voted for the measure. The Senate understood and the Senate conferees understood, as well as the House understood and the House conferees understood, the effect of the duty upon hides. We knew, when we fixed this duty, whether we were imposing the duty for the benefit of the packers or for the benefit of the cattle raiser. Of course it is possible always for these trusts to cheat the people out of what they are entitled to; that has to be taken into consideration. But we had taken all those matters into consideration when we passed the bill, and the Senate had deliberately decided that if this emergency tariff bill was to be passed, this one provision in favor of the cattle raisers of the country should be an integral part of it.

I, as well as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], heard the discussion in conference. I heard some talk there about the packers robbing the cattle raisers of the benefit of this duty. I take it that if that had been the only objection made by the conferees on the part of the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate would never have yielded on this provision of the bill.

The truth is, Mr. President, in the conferences there was far more discussion of the effect upon the measure of the mistake which has been made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] in introducing his amendment for a 10 per cent additional compensatory duty for the manufacturers by leaving out the very important word "additional." The Senator from Massachusetts asked that the duty be raised to a point where it would have been nearly three times the duty upon the raw material. He made a mistake. The conferees said, "We can not correct that mistake without injustice to the manufacturer of the raw product." But the conferees were wrong, Mr. President. The conferees had the power to strike out the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, and that would have left the duty of 30 per cent given under existing law upon the manufactures of leather, or twice as high a duty as that imposed upon the raw material in the Senate amendment.

Here we have a conference committee slaughtering one of the most important provisions of a bill, because they are unable, by reason of a mistake, to grant to the manufacturers of that raw material a compensatory duty of 300 per cent instead of 200 per cent. That is the secret of the whole business, and nothing illustrates better the principle which runs through this bill, and all "protective" tariff bills, of giving to the manufacturer by way of a "compensatory" duty an additional protective rate greater than is given to the producer of his raw material.

I undertake to say, Mr. President, that if you give this bill, as it passed the Senate and House and as it was acted upon by the conferees, a close scrutiny and analysis, you will find that it contains that vicious discrimination to be found in all of our "protective" tariff legislation in favor of the manufacturers, and that even in passing a bill ostensibly for the purpose of helping the farmer the farmer's interest as well as that of the consumer is made secondary to that of the manufacturers.

Mr. President, I do not recall, since I have been connected with tariff legislation, a more flagrant miscarriage of justice than was perpetuated by the conferees in the slaughter of this Senate amendment with reference to hides, especially when you consider the chief purpose and reason for that slaughter.

I have no doubt, after hearing the discussions in the conference, that if the matter could have been so adjusted under the rules that the manufacturers of these hides could have secured 300 per cent compensatory duty instead of 200 per cent, the duty on hides would have remained in the bill. But I do not wish to devote any more time to that.

The conferees somewhat reduced the Senate increase in the duty on Sumatra wrapper tobacco, grown principally in Connecticut and Massachusetts, I believe, and grown there under cover. They reduced the additional duty on Sumatra tobacco from \$1 a pound to 50 cents a pound, still leaving a duty of \$3 a pound upon unstemmed Sumatra wrapper tobacco. They retained 50 cents per pound of the proposed increase in this duty in the face of the fact that one of the conferees on the part of the House had in his possession information, and communicated that fact to the conferees, that on that very day unstemmed Sumatra tobacco was selling at the rate of \$5 a pound in the markets of this country.

An emergency tariff, indeed! A tariff ostensibly to help the farmer against an abnormal depreciation in the prices of his product; a tariff intended and calculated, it is claimed, to lift up the prices of agricultural products to a fairly remunerative price level! Instead of striking out that additional duty proposed, when it was brought to the attention of the conferees that the price of this agricultural product had advanced to the unheard of figures of \$5 a pound, they retained one-half of it, and thereby added 50 cents per pound to the already existing duty of \$2.50 a pound to help out the distressed producers of this Connecticut product.

Now, a word upon sugar. As I said before, there are not many provisions in this bill which can be of any benefit to the farmer or producer, because there are either no importations, or the importations are so negligible that the duty upon them will not affect the price of the domestic product, notably so in the case of corn; notably so in the case of the ordinary type of tobacco grown in this country; notably the case with the growers of the 12,000,000 bales of short-staple cotton in this country. It can not be of any help to the men raising these products, not only because imports are negligible but because of our large excess production and heavy exports placing prices upon an export basis.

The duties that are imposed on these products in the bill for the benefit of the farmer in most instances are fake duties. They are such transparent frauds that they deceive no one except the overcredulous. There are some of them, however, not many of them, that are not fake duties. There are a few of the duties imposed in the bill that will increase the domestic price of the commodity. Sugar is one of those items. No one can question the fact that on account of the vast importations of sugar into the country, on account of the fact that we do not raise all the sugar we consume, but only about half as much, that any duty imposed on sugar will immediately raise the price of all the sugar produced in the United States as well as the price of the imported sugar at the port of entry to the extent of the duty.

On the Finance Committee are some of the strongest friends of the sugar industry in this body, possessed of full information, and yet deliberately that committee added sugar to the items contained in the bill and fixed the duty at 3 cents a pound. When the bill came to the Senate there was no suggestion or intimation that the duty be changed, that it was excessive, that it should be reduced to a reasonable figure, until the rapid-fire assaults of this side of the Chamber against the iniquity of imposing this additional tax upon this product in the interest of the cane and beet producers and sugar refiners of the country, thereby placing a tax of \$300,000,000 every year upon the breakfast table of the poor and the rich alike. When that situation was fully developed, when the shocking wrongs of this increased protection to this product were exposed an amendment was proposed by the committee reducing the annual burden to be placed upon the breakfast table from \$300,000,000 a year to \$100,000,000 a year.

Then the matter went to conference, and when it got into conference the duty on sugar was a little bit further reduced, but only a little bit. Cuban sugar under the bill would have paid 2 cents additional, but was reduced in conference to 1.60 cents, though the rate remains at 2 cents per pound on all other sugar. Why was that reduction made in conference? Here is one of the most significant things about the whole business, a fact that I

desire to impress upon the minds of Senators. I will tell why this sugar duty was reduced. It was not because there was any change of heart on the part of the protectionists of the Republican Party represented on that conference committee, either on the part of the House or the Senate, but because the Republican conferees on the part of the House said, "The Members of the House are getting restless—alarmed—over the thought of increasing duties much beyond the Payne-Aldrich rates," and expressed doubt if the Senate amendment rates much in excess of those fixed by the Payne-Aldrich Act were adopted by the conferees whether the bill could be put through the House.

Not only in the case of sugar, but also in the case of other commodities added by the Senate, was this suggestion made by the House conferees, spokesmen as they were of a body that only a few weeks ago wrote into this bill duties ranging from 20 to 300 per cent higher than those fixed by the Payne-Aldrich bill. My fellow Senators, think of the House conferees under these circumstances, when these Senate amendments were under consideration, with uplifted hands, appealing to the Senate conferees to pull down their rates nearer to the basis of the Payne-Aldrich enactment.

But one inference can be drawn from this ludicrous spectacle, and that is that since the House passed the bill fixing the rates from 20 to 300 per cent in excess of the Payne-Aldrich bill, they have heard from home—heard from the people, heard from an indignant press speaking in behalf of the millions of consumers of these products.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. In just a moment. Let me complete this thought.

Now they are asking for a reduction of the Senate rates, which were no higher than, in fact not as high as, the House rates, down to the level of the Payne-Aldrich bill. Oh, Senators, when I sat there and listened to those appeals I could not help smiling when the thought came to me, "If you could only get hold of the House rates"—they were beyond their reach because they were not in conference—"If you could only get hold of the House rates! Now that the fear of the people has been put into your hearts, how you would slash those rates!" It is a mighty good thing to hear from the people occasionally, and the people have been heard from in this matter. And in response we have the House conferees trying to reduce those Senate rates in excess of those of the Payne-Aldrich bill.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator said no friend of the amendment made a protest against it until it was discussed upon the Democratic side of the Chamber. I think I told the Senator the day the bill was reported that I would not support the amendment. I know I told the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] that I would not support the amendment as it was reported to the Senate, referring to the sugar schedule.

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought all Senators understood it. I have not heard from the people, I have not heard from the press, and I think the Senator ought to be perfectly fair.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am anxious to be fair to the Senator. I have no recollection of the Senator saying anything of that kind to me, but I will say I think the Senator from Utah takes a very much saner view of these matters than a good many of his Republican colleagues. I wish to say that I have not found the Senator, in connection with the tariff levies, ready to go to the extreme limit that others have gone.

Mr. President, there was some little reduction in conference of the duty on butter, cheese and cheese substitutes, and condensed milk. I do not think these reductions amount to very much, in view of the fact that we export several hundred times more of those products, speaking of them as an aggregate quantity, than we import.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt in connection with the Senator's argument with reference to the operations of the bill? It seems to me somewhat irritated by the condition as to milk, and not only as to sugar, which, as I understand, has advanced 2 cents a pound in the last week in contemplation of the passage of the pending measure. Whereas the farmer, the dairyman, is getting no increase in the price of his milk, my information is, and it is quite reliable, that condensed milk has advanced over 2 cents a pound within the last week or 10 days. That is quite an item to the consumers of the country, and it is done merely in contemplation of what this measure provides.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not at all surprised at the feeling of the Senator. I was told this morning that sugar had, as the Senator says, advanced 2 cents a pound, and I am not surprised to hear of the other advances the Senator mentions.

Mr. SMOOT. Two cents a pound?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is in the retail market.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know what the retail market is. The sugar market on Saturday disclosed that Cuban sugar had advanced about one-quarter of a cent a pound from its price when the bill was introduced to the figure at which it sold last Saturday. Of course, when you talk about the retailer, you can not touch him. The retailer has too many votes and the retailer is the one who has been profiteering upon the people of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. We can not touch the retailer, but the retailer will touch the consumer all right.

Mr. SMOOT. Undoubtedly.

Mr. FLETCHER. The trouble is that the consumer has nothing to do with what goes on in Cuba or what goes on with the refiners and that sort of thing. He does not know about that. He can not keep up with that. But he does know when he goes to market and the groceryman charges him 2 more cents to-day than he charged him on yesterday; he not only understands that but he begins to feel it after a while. The same is true in reference to condensed milk.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not bought any sugar at retail, so I do not know what the price is, but I do know when we began to discuss the question there were places retailing sugar for 8 cents a pound; I mean the Piggly-Wiggles or whatever they call them. Their advertisements were in the paper. The regular grocers were selling sugar at 8½ cents a pound. I do not know what it is to-day, but I can find out in a few moments; but if anyone is selling sugar at a 2 cent per pound increase, it is not because the price of sugar has been advanced by the refiner or by those who produce beet sugar in the West.

Mr. FLETCHER. I find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Saturday, in the discussion in the House, that Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY had this to say:

Some of them have just phoned me this morning stating that, although sugar was selling at the Piggly-Wiggly stores in this city, which are large distributors of sugar, three days ago for \$7.35 a hundred, this morning, with this report pending and the certainty of its passage, the price of sugar has been increased to \$9 per hundred pounds.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, it was not selling at the Piggly-Wiggly stores at \$7.35 at any time. It did sell there for a while at 8 cents a pound, when they were making the run on sugar. The regular price of sugar was 8½ cents anywhere else. In fact, I bought a sack of it, and had to pay \$8.75. If they are selling it at 2 cents a pound more, there is no excuse other than profiteering on the part of the man who sells the sugar.

Mr. SIMMONS. As I have said, most of the duties imposed in this bill will not increase the price of the products upon which they are to be levied, supposedly in behalf of the producer, and with a view of raising those prices to a point where production would be profitable.

But there are many of them, as I have said heretofore, which will have the undoubted effect of increasing the cost of these products, in some instances to an unreasonable extent, to the consumer without material, or, at least, to anything like the same extent benefiting the producer.

Mr. President, the Republican Party came into power on a distinct promise to the people, namely, that it would immediately, without delay, by every instrumentality in its power reduce the high cost of living that had grown to be one of the greatest evils that confronted and oppressed the people. There was a crying demand when the World War was over that such legislation be enacted and such administrative measures be pursued as were intended and calculated to bring about that result. If the Republican Party has passed one single act since it came into power in Congress which is intended or calculated to reduce the high cost of living in this country, I have never heard of it, and I would be glad to be advised if it is claimed that there has been any such legislation.

On the contrary, Mr. President, the very first piece of positive affirmative legislation offered by the Republican Party that could affect and would affect the prices of products, especially the necessities of life, the very first measure of that kind which is presented here is a measure not by implication intended to raise prices, but by express admission and proud avowal upon the floor of the Senate is proclaimed as a measure intended to increase and advance the prices, not only of a number of necessary staple food products but of the clothing which the people wear.

A striking and astonishing thing about this bill, Mr. President, is that most of the duties it levies for this ostensible purpose which will or can be effective in raising prices are duties granting additional protection to industries that really need no additional protection, giving protection to industries that are either controlled by a trust or whose product is now selling higher than it sold for before the war. Take sugar, for instance. It is deliberately proposed in this bill to increase the duty on

sugar—in the interest of the cane and beet sugar producers and the sugar refiners, in order to add to the producers' profits in the sale of this essential of life—and sugar is an essential of life, already artificially enhanced in price by what has always been regarded as a high protective rate. It is deliberately proposed that this necessity of life, now selling far beyond what it sold for in prewar times, be further artificially increased in the interest of the refiners as well as producers of the cane and beet, thereby, as I said, laying by legislation an additional burden of \$100,000,000 a year upon the breakfast tables of 25,000,000 American households.

But the Republican majority have not stopped there. The Senate put in this bill an amendment which the conferees have not touched, imposing a duty of 2 cents a pound on fresh and frozen meats imported into this country. It is admitted that large quantities of frozen meat were imported last year from Argentina. This duty will undoubtedly be effective; if it is not effective in helping the cattle growers and the meat raisers, it will be effective in helping the meat packers; it will furnish them an excuse and that is all they want for raising their prices. Under any and all conditions it is absolutely certain, I say to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Jones], that if this duty remains in the bill, as it will if the conference report is agreed to, the packers will make it the excuse for adding that much at least to the price of their products. Every Senator here knows that the packers have it in their power to fix the price of meats at any figure they see fit. Nothing restrains them except public opinion, and they brush that aside if they can find a plausible excuse, or pretense of excuse, and the majority have written in this bill all the excuse that the packers want.

There are consumed in this country, I believe, according to the statistics, about 24,000,000,000 pounds of meat every year. Two cents a pound upon that—meat products we annually consume—will amount to between four hundred and five hundred million dollars. What does the Republican Party, pledged to reducing the cost of living, have to say to this provision imposing between four hundred and five hundred million dollars a year upon the food of the poor and the rich alike in this country? That meat duty remains in the conference report. I felt after the exposure of this item of the bill upon the floor of the Senate that the Republican conferees would at least have enough consideration for the people of this country to strike it out, but they did not do so.

Now, the Senator from North Dakota says that the duty we are imposing by this bill upon wheat of 35 cents a bushel, which means \$2.10 a barrel on flour, will be effective, and that it will raise the price of wheat very nearly, if not quite, to the limit of this protective duty. If it does, Mr. President, then what will we have? It is estimated that every man, woman, and child consumes annually on an average a barrel and a half of flour. The conferees did cut the duty 5 cents. They cut it down upon the same plea that was, as I stated, made by the House conferees with reference to sugar, namely, that the country would not stand for duties much in excess of the Payne-Aldrich rates. Upon that plea, made in the conference committee when this item came up, as a matter of compromise 5 cents a bushel was cut off, and the duty was reduced from 40 cents to 35 cents.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator's statement reminds me of something I saw in the papers a day or two ago. A man was held up by a footpad and robbed of all he had except 5 cents, which were left him to get home on the street car.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is about the way it is going to be in this case, Mr. President. But let me finish. What will be the effect of this duty? If it is effective in the way and to the extent stated and claimed by the Senator from North Dakota, in charge of this bill and who represents on this floor one of the chief wheat-growing sections of this country and who is a member of the Finance Committee and a very able and a very fair-minded member, too—if it has that effect, that provision of the bill will levy an additional \$200,000,000 upon the dining table of the poor and rich alike.

There is another provision in the bill which I had hoped would be stricken out. Its iniquities were so transparent and were so conclusively demonstrated in the argument in the Senate, that I did hope it would be stricken out. I refer to the compensatory duty upon manufactures of cotton.

An utterly worthless duty of 7 cents a pound was imposed on raw cotton—a duty that will help none of the producers of the 12,000,000 bales of short-staple cotton in this country, not a whit, not worth the snap of my finger. I am a cotton farmer, and I know what I am talking about; but because of this utterly useless duty imposed upon the raw material, the friends of the textile manufacturers of the country insisted upon putting in this bill a provision that will allow a compensatory duty of 7

cents a pound upon the manufactured products brought in from abroad.

Of course, as all of these fine goods that we get from Europe are made in part of Egyptian cotton, that means, as I explained when this item was up in the Senate, that we will have to pay a duty of 7 cents a pound on nearly all the cotton materials, including clothing, that we import, and of course the domestic manufacturer will take advantage of that, as they will have a right to do, and advance their price accordingly; and so the people of this country would have to pay a duty of 7 cents a pound upon practically all the cotton goods they would buy.

I have no means of estimating—in fact, I have not tried to estimate—the extent of the burden this item would impose upon the consuming public, but I think it would not fall far below \$100,000,000. Add it all together—\$100,000,000 on account of sugar; four hundred millions or more on account of meat, frozen and fresh; two hundred millions on account of wheat; one hundred millions on accounts of clothes—and this bill, in four of its provisions, would add to the cost of living something like one billion dollars a year. That is the way in which the Republican Party proposes to reduce the cost of living!

Help the farmer? Why, Mr. President, the farmer will soon realize, if this bill is passed and should receive presidential approval, that its benefits to him will be small compared to the additional amount he will have to pay by reason of it for such of these necessities as he does not produce.

A more transparent, unblushing fraud was never attempted to be perpetrated upon a people than the Republican politicians who are responsible and sponsors for this legislation are now seeking to fasten upon the American people, not because they believe in it—no, no! They do not believe in it any more than I do. They are led to do this thing, this wicked thing, for supposed partisan advantage, as a vehicle for the propagation of their protective tariff theories, to lure the farmer into the acceptance of that scheme of taxation, and by placating him with this miserable sop to make his resistance less formidable to highly protective rates to be laid in the projected scheme of general tariff revision upon the things the farmer buys. It is a conspiracy of deceit contrived and perpetrated in name and guise of friendship.

Mr. President, the members of the party in power have had abundant opportunity during their 2-year term here to help the farmer if they wanted to in ways that would be unquestionable and in measures that would be of great benefit and value to him. Have they availed themselves of a single proffered opportunity, however inviting it has been? On the contrary, they have passed these opportunities and importunities by in silence, if not with contempt.

Here a few days ago we had up a bill, and an amendment was offered to it which provided for an appropriation of \$200,000,000 to be advanced to the Federal farm loan bank to enable that institution to advance money to the farmer upon his land, and relieve him to some extent from the distressed situation in which he finds himself to-day. You will remember what happened. What was the response of the other side of the Chamber, now pretending to be the friends of the farmer, to that proposition? It passed, it got through; but, Senators, you know that it received the sanction of this body only by and through the votes of Democratic Senators, aided by a few progressive Republicans on the other side. You know that that measure, fraught with so much benefit to the farmer—a measure that it was so apparent would have brought much needed relief to him in his present condition—received no sympathy from the other side of the Chamber, except in isolated instances.

I think my good friend the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], who sits over there, offered an amendment to one of the appropriation bills a few days ago proposing to utilize the \$100,000,000 that the Federal reserve banks have accumulated by way of profits, not to be invested in farm-land mortgages, as the measure I have just spoken about provided, but to be lent to him upon his agricultural products, and thus to reach and relieve another aspect of the farmer's troubles. Coupled with the measure providing \$200,000,000 for farm-loan banks I can conceive of no two measures that this Congress could pass that would afford as much immediate relief to the farmers in their present situation as those two measures. I want to ask the Senator from South Dakota what sort of a reception his amendment met with from the committee in charge of the bill to which he offered it as an amendment, as I understand?

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from North Carolina that he is familiar with the reception that the bill had at the hands of the committee.

Mr. SIMMONS. That reception was a point of order against it?

Mr. STERLING. A point of order.

Mr. SIMMONS. They incontinently kicked it out on a technicality.

Mr. STERLING. But I will say to the Senator from North Carolina that that point of order was finally waived. After I had given notice that I should move to suspend the rules, the chairman of the committee waived the point of order, and a vote was taken upon the proposition here in the Senate.

Mr. SIMMONS. Upon the proposition to suspend the rules?

Mr. STERLING. No; a vote was taken on the proposition directly in the Senate. The chairman of the committee finally waived the point of order, and a vote was taken. That was the status. I want to say, further, that I should have pressed the matter further, and should have introduced it as an amendment to another bill, but for the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury had taken the net earnings for the year 1920, under very doubtful authority, and applied them to the payment of the debts of the Government.

Mr. SIMMONS. The fact remains that the Senator's amendment was presented and voted down.

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. The other side of the Chamber, of course, is responsible for legislation. They have a majority here, and it was defeated—on a viva voce vote, I presume.

Again, Mr. President, only a few days ago—I believe it has not quite come to a final determination yet—we had a battle royal here in the Senate over a matter in which the farmers of the country are profoundly interested. It was a measure intended largely, and advocated for that purpose, to enable the farmer to get his fertilizers, which in many parts of the country constitute a very essential part of the cost of production, at a lower price than fertilizers are now being offered to him for. I refer to the Muscle Shoals proposition. Senators will remember what sort of a reception this measure—advocated by such friends of the farmer as the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] as a sure means of reducing the cost of the farmer's fertilizer—received from the other side of this Chamber.

Never since I have been here has the other side of the Chamber made so persistent, so determined, and such a resolute fight against a proposition of this importance, asked for in behalf of such a large part of the people, and that part so greatly in need of help, as the fight made upon this measure. That fight has been carried to conference. The Republican Party in both Houses have set themselves against it.

Mr. President, there is another measure in which the farmers are more deeply interested than any other class of our people which has had hard sledding, the good-roads proposition. Senators know how earnestly the friends of the farmers on this side of the Chamber have pressed the good-roads matter, how earnestly we advocated putting in one of the appropriation bills an amendment appropriating \$100,000,000 to carry on the good work of improving the rural highways of the country—highways which are used by the city folks largely for pleasure, but highways which are used by the farmer as a means of getting his products to the market. The farmers ask for good roads, hard-surfaced roads, in order that they might, by the use of automobiles and motor trucks, protect themselves, in part at least, against the high freight and passenger rates charged, and permitted under the law to be charged, by the railroads. They were appealing to Congress for a little help, that they may get their products, which are selling now below the cost of production, to market at less cost. Here was an opportunity to help that vast army who follow that occupation which in best conditions is surrounded and fraught with so many discomforts, inconveniences, hardships, and sacrifices, but so essential to the well-being of all the people, and to mitigate to some degree the trials, tribulations, and difficulties of those who follow it.

In answer to that proposition, the committee in charge of the bill to which it was sought to apply this amendment, through its chairman and his lieutenants, supported by the Republican side of the Chamber, defeated a motion to suspend the rules of the Senate in order to make this amendment in favor of farmers in order. I challenge them here and now, speaking here as a farmer myself and in behalf of the farmers—and I have a right to speak for them, for practically every dollar I have in the world, except that invested in my home, is invested in farm property—I challenge the majority side of this Chamber to show me one single measure it has proposed, or has permitted to pass the Senate, in favor of the farmer, except this measly, niggardly, fraudulent, deceptive, and iniquitous bill, drawn, in the last analysis, so that it will help, not the farmer, but certain great, powerful trusts, notably the packers' trust, the sugar refining trust, and so forth. Where there are any benefits of any

consequence in this bill for anybody, they, and not the farmers, are going to be the beneficiaries.

Mr. President, the time for argument has passed, and I will not pursue that any longer. I think I give expression to what is known and understood here, and on the outside as well, understood and talked about by practically everybody. I believe I give expression to what is known as a fact when I say that while there are those who are supporting this measure in a laudable desire to help a helpless class of overburdened toilers, there are those who are supporting it, not because they believe in it, for they are opposed to it; not because they want it to become law, for they do not, but because they believe it will never become a law; supporting it for partisan advantage; supporting it as a vehicle of propaganda in favor of the protective tariff theory; supporting it in the interest of partisan politics and not because they wish its enactment for the benefit and relief of the distressed farmers of the country.

These enemies of the bill, these men on the other side of the Chamber who are as much opposed to this bill as I am opposed to it, who believe that its enactment into law would be a calamity, nevertheless, have voted for it, and will vote for the conference report. But they voted for it only because they felt certain that the President would veto it, and I now say to these Republican supporters of the bill, if Mr. Harding were in the White House instead of Mr. Wilson, you would not adopt this conference report; if Mr. Harding had been in the White House instead of Mr. Wilson the day you voted on this bill in the Senate, it would have been overwhelmingly defeated here—and with your votes.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CALDER in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. Can the Senator from North Carolina give us any assurance that this hope of a presidential veto will be gratified?

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from New Hampshire was the one shining exception. The Senator had the courage to vote against the bill, notwithstanding the arguments that were urged upon him in the interest of the partisan advantage. I will say to the Senator I sincerely hope and confidently believe it will be vetoed.

Mr. MOSES. I did vote against it, Mr. President, and I purpose to vote against this conference report, if it ever comes to a vote. I resent the imputation, Mr. President, that this is a Republican measure. It is neither a Republican measure nor a Democratic measure. It is class legislation of the most vicious kind, as I regard it. If it is to have any party appellation at all, Mr. President, it is to be described as soviet legislation.

Mr. SIMMONS. I invite the Senator to continue in his characterization. I was very much interested in his speech the other day. It was the finest characterization of the iniquities and the fraudulency of the measure, if I may be permitted to coin a word, that I ever heard.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the Senator from North Carolina for his complimentary allusion to my feeble remarks of the other day. I regret that I can not accept his invitation to continue, because the one thing I have taken away from such classical study as I pursued in the days of my youth is to fear the Greeks when bearing gifts.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am pleased to find the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from New Hampshire in such wonderful agreement upon this bill. I have just heard the Senator from North Carolina condemning earnestly the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, which the Senator from New Hampshire offered as an amendment to this bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I have not had much to say about the Payne-Aldrich law. I only referred to the little unpleasantness in the conference over the rates of that repudiated measure.

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope the Senator will pardon me for interrupting him, but when it went over on Saturday I understood that the Senator wanted about 10 minutes to discuss this conference report. I know that his address has been elongated somewhat by interruptions, but—

Mr. SIMMONS. I confess, Mr. President, I did not expect to occupy much time. But this bill is a subject which causes one, when he wakes up to its iniquities, to enthuse in his opposition and denunciation of it and leads him into paths of thought and discussion he did not intend to travel.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, it is perfectly true that the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from New Hampshire are in accord with reference to this measure. It is also true that those two Senators are probably as far apart as the poles upon the general subject of tariff legislation.

As I said in the remarks which the Senator from North Carolina has been so good as to compliment, I am an all-around protectionist. I believe that if wool is to be protected manufactures of wool should be equally protected. It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I voted for the compensatory duties contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. It is for that reason that I offered my amendment to the bill—to give us relief in every section of American industry.

This emergency, if an emergency exists, is not confined merely to the agricultural portions of the community; it is widespread in every part of the land. It was produced in the first instance, as I believe, by the consumers' strike, to which the Senator from Connecticut so graphically alluded in the course of the debate upon the bill, and owing to that consumers' strike mills and factories have been compelled to shut down, because there was no market for their wares. But people have had to continue to buy the things which they must eat. The bill to my mind puts an absolutely unjust burden upon the portion of the community which could not raise but had to buy the things which they eat.

Because of the one-sided, unnatural arrangement of the schedules of the bill I could not vote for it. I have never felt that the emergency was by any means as acute as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has sought to make us believe. I have felt that the bill was designed to benefit a particular class in the country who, as everyone knows, received high prices for their products during the swollen days of the war, and if they spent those profits in the purchase of limousines and in trips to Miami and Palm Beach the country should not now be penalized.

Their crisis, if any exists, is by no means absolute. It is comparative, and it is comparative only with the high prices of the days of the war. If they were to compact the sum total of their distress into a motto, it could be expressed no better than by the advertisement "Used car for sale."

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the measure is such a wretched farce that the sooner the curtain is rung down the better. I am not going to continue my discussion. In a few hours, or it may be in less than an hour, the seal of approval by the Congress will be placed upon this iniquity. In the meantime I sympathize somewhat with the members of that contingent upon the other side of the aisle to whom I referred a little while ago when I said that while they were uproariously for the bill, they were for it provided it was vetoed. I sympathize with them. As the time draws near I have noticed various evidences of impatience on their part, impatience for speed and action, accompanied with nervousness and apprehension.

I can understand it, Mr. President. They feel reasonably certain that the President is going to veto the measure. They almost feel that his action in that behalf is beyond doubt, and yet there is just a lingering fear on their part that, perchance, by some turn of the wheel of fortune he might approve it. They are not uneasy about the result of the vote on the conference report. They know what that is going to be, but they are uneasy, just slightly nervous, about the fate of the bill at the other end of the Avenue. However strongly and confidently they may believe that it is going to be vetoed, they are not quite certain about it. Their impatience in this regard will not be abated, their nerves will not be steadied, their apprehensions will not be quieted, and they will not be altogether happy and serene until they hear for a certainty from the White House that the deed has been done and that this misshapen creature which they have brought into the world is dead. That is the only apprehension in the Republican mind now.

What a panic would be precipitated upon the other side of the Chamber if to-morrow morning they should wake up and find that the bill had not been vetoed, that the child they have brought into existence is not dead. Oh, they want the child to be born, and born alive, because they think in the birth there will come to them and their party advantage, but, above all things, they hope and pray that that child will be speedily put to death at the other end of the Avenue. I have no doubt it will be duly dispatched when the bill arrives there. I, for one, am content that it should be so; content that this legislative monstrosity, this bastard of legislation, should meet its death at the hands of a great Democratic President, at the hands of the man known of all men as one who has won his high place in office by reason of the public confidence in his devotion and con-

secration to the cause of the people. However, I wish to say now, and I say it to my Republican colleagues and offer it as a prediction, and I am willing that the prediction be recorded, that if President Wilson vetoes this measure, as he will, the Republican Party in Congress will never give President-to-be Harding, after he reaches the White House, an opportunity to sign it or one of similar import.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina on the question of hide duties. This morning I received a letter from a customer of mine in Germany, a tanner, at Weinheim, in Baden, perhaps the largest tanner of calfskins in the world, certainly one of the largest. Up to the time of the war he was among my very best customers for raw calfskins. Of late I have had no trade with him until this month, when I received an order for some hides. I must confess my surprise. I do not know what it means, unless it is that the price of hides has receded to such an extent here that there is a temptation to come from Germany to Vermont to replenish their stock of raw material.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator will recall the statement I made that the importations of hides had been more excessive than the importations of any other article upon which a duty is provided in the bill, and therefore, if there was anything in the bill that might be benefited by the tariff, hides are one item; and yet the duty on hides was stricken out.

Mr. PAGE. As the Senator will remember, in the olden times of the Payne-Aldrich bill I was in favor of free hides. I do not know that I have changed my views now. It is not because I am not a good protectionist, but rather because I think the conditions that affect the hide trade are so peculiar that I am rather inclined to be a believer in nondutiable hides. Without taking the time of the Senate, I should like permission to insert in the Record, without reading, the letter to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, permission is granted.

The letter referred to is as follows:

The president of the German tanners' association writes about the effect of the treaty of Versailles on the German leather industry as follows:

"In order to come to a clear understanding of the effect of the Versailles treaty and the corresponding agreements of Spa and Paris on the German leather industry, there must be distinguished between the general and special effects both treaties are impressing on this industry. All the difficulties on change and the checking of the production, existing in all other German industries, have come about the leather industry, too. This industry is dependent with regard to three-fourths of its raw material on foreign countries. The financial disorder of our country in consequence of the severe conditions of the Versailles treaty and the following agreements, the complete disorganization of our traffic, the continual fluctuations of the change of the 'mark,' do not permit the entering of any risked business on a larger scale abroad. Therefore we are deficient of raw material. The exchange of goods from one country to another is almost impossible, as nearly all financially strong countries are suffering from overproduction, viz, they are closing themselves by prohibition and hindrance of import and export. The increase of production, the only possible means for our recovery, has been prevented till now by the terribly heavy terms of the Versailles treaty, setting at defiance any attempt of restoration.

"The general want of coal, another consequence of the Spa arrangements, deprived the leather industry of this most important material. The industry tried to supply coal by consuming bark and by the use of brown coal, wood, and turf, after altering the boilers. A lot of firms do not know whether there will be to-morrow at their disposal a sufficient quantity of fuel. There can be no doubt that steam engines can not be kept going on by the use of bark. At any rate under such circumstances the wanted degree of heat will not be obtained to dry the leather in bad weather. Thus the tanning industry, one of the largest German industries has been forced in consequence of the agreement of Spa to reduce its working capacity considerably.

"In particular the effect of the Versailles treaty makes itself felt by section 68, which provides that Germany must import free of duty from Alsace-Lorraine the same quantities of goods she used to buy there before the war. Exact figures about the production of the Alsatian firms during the war are known, and these figures are built up upon the controlled self-estimates of their production in the last year of peace.

"Well known are furthermore the figures of distribution of hides and skins on basis of the productivity of these firms during the war.

"There is further before us an estimate of home consumption in that country and another with regard to the export of leather before the war. On basis of these calculations Alsace-Lorraine ought to export to Germany not more than 4,300 tons of sole leather, beltings, harness, and russet leather, and 220 tons of chrome upper leather.

"France has fixed the quantity of the products enjoying exemption from duty in virtue of the article 68 of the treaty of peace at 12,500 tons for leather for the year of 1920-21. The war production of the old and larger Germany amounted to 3,000 to 4,000 tons of leather monthly, viz, about 50,000 tons a year, including the occupied countries. Alsace-Lorraine shall now be allowed to import free of duty one-fourth of the whole war production. This is naturally a heavy burden on the German industry and certainly against the sense of the treaty that three times as much leather is imported this way than would correspond with the production of these Provinces. For the larger part, the leather imported on this section 68 is not homemade, but of French, Spanish, and Italian origin.

"What is the use of a tariff on leather which anyway forms a very small compensation for the surplus of cost, caused by the duty on tanning extracts, if such quantities of leather are imported free of

duty through the Alsatian hole from all countries of the world, partly of inferior quality and even heavily and fraudulently charged?

"There is no need to comment on such facts; they speak for themselves. The world expects from Germany reparations and indemnities; how shall she pay, when the last Paris agreements make export impossible by charging on one side export taxes and forbidding on the other side free entrance of German goods and German merchants in foreign countries?

"And who is going to pay that tax? Certainly not Germany. The consequence would be that the German exporting industry, which must pay the imports of food and raw material for the whole nation, gets ruined. The effect on the foreign markets of raw material is clear. Who would buy in Germany under such conditions the Egyptian or American cotton; who could buy East Indian or American hides and skins or foreign leather for making shoes unless so much cheaper as amounts the charge of the new tribute? And the consumers in all countries certainly had to pay higher prices and get poorer quality if a large factor of international competition is knocked dead.

"Conditions caused by the diplomats at Versailles and the following negotiations are not encouraging for the German industry; nevertheless we are convinced that the sound sense of the merchants all over the world finally gets away with all these barriers to human welfare, unless bolshevism shall rule over the world."

MR. THOMAS. Mr. President, I desire to record a last word of protest to the bill before it receives sanction of the Senate. I shall try to be very brief.

I opposed the measure when it was before the Senate. Hence I will content myself with a summary of the objections which I then recorded against it. I knew it would receive the final sanction of both Houses and go to conference, and I was equally certain that virtually every amendment which the Senate placed upon it would be accepted, as would have been any other amendments which this body in its wisdom or in the interest of localities might have seen fit to insert. It is now here in its last stages, and we shall accept the conference report, as a foregone fact.

The bill is entitled "An act to impose temporary duties upon certain agricultural products, to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes." That title is entirely misleading. It should be called "An act to impose temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet emergency political obligations." If not, it otherwise would have been reported without any consideration at all from the Ways and Means Committee of the House and but very little at the hands of the Finance Committee of the Senate. The Payne-Aldrich bill was called a bill of abominations, and truly so. Public opinion of America denounced that bill as the limit of high protection, but this goes so far beyond that measure as to make it appear more than equitable by comparison. If that was a bill of abominations, this is a bill of damnations, and in my judgment the most infamous measure that has ever received the approval of an American Congress; for it is a fraud, a deception, and an inquiry from its inception to its close.

While those who advocate it may be perfectly sincere in their convictions of its needs, they will discover, if the bill becomes a law, that its only effect will be to increase, and measurably increase, the high cost of living, while bringing benefit to none.

During the discussion here to-day it has been disclosed that two essential necessities of life have already risen in price to the consumer, sugar being quoted to-day and Saturday to the consumer at 2 cents a pound in advance of the previously prevailing price. That means the levy of a tax upon the American consumers of sugar of \$100,000 a day. Whether this bill be approved or vetoed, it is even now at work upon the pocket-book of the consumer and will so continue until it has been disposed of. The newspaper dispatches of last week, Mr. President, carried accounts of several enormous and sensational robberies, principally directed against the Post Office Department, and in each instance the bandits made away with the loot. I can have some respect for that sort of robbery, because a man who perpetrates it takes the law in his hands and also takes some chances with his life; but a robbery which is coolly, carefully, and craftily designed, as a legislative act deliberately conferring upon one class of our people the power to levy toll upon all the rest, and to do so safely, securely, and reputably, presents a contrast between the man of action and the man who sneaks into the back door and levies his tribute during the absence of the family from home to the advantage of the former.

Personally I do not know whether the President will veto this bill or not; I have never presumed to speak for him since I have been a Member of the Senate, and I certainly have no authority to do so now; but if I wished the Harding administration ill, which I do not, if I entertained any personal animosity toward the Republican Party, which I do not, and if the prayers of the wicked availed anything, which they never do, I should pray for his approval of this bill, for in the event it becomes a law, or anything approaching it is ever enacted into law, then I say to my Republican brethren woe unto your coming administration. You defied public sentiment upon this subject, ignored your platform in 1909, and enacted a bill which caused your undoing, split your party asunder, and placed the Democratic

Party in power. If you think the people have changed their convictions since that time, if you think by increasing the extent of your tariff robberies, and including within their pale every producer of agricultural products, it will add to your prestige and overcome this former disadvantage, then you certainly reckon against all my experience of the operations of human nature.

If this bill is good for anything, it must levy an enormous toll upon all of the consumers of the country. I defy any man to contradict that statement. If you levy that toll upon the consumers of the country, think you that they will bear it with equanimity, or be comforted with the notion that else this bill shall operate some industry or industries will be ruined? Oh, no, Mr. President; I know that protection is running to-day like a mad dog, with foam on its lips, throughout every community in the United States, and the poison of its virus is dividing people into classes everywhere. Every class has its organization, with its Washington lobby bent upon securing class legislation. Mr. Gompers the other day announced what he pleased to call a new declaration of independence for labor, the substance of which is the demand by organized labor of exemption for its membership from the operation of our general laws. It has just as much right to demand such exemption as the wool grower or the stock grower or the farmer or the manufacturer or any other protected industry has to demand and secure the unequal operations of the law. You can not grant one and withhold the other.

The secretary of the American Protective Tariff League in 1911, in a circular letter, declared that once the farmer found out that protection was not for him there would be an end to the system. He therefore urged everybody to besiege and beseech Representatives and Senators to vote against the reciprocity treaty, lest they discover the fact through its operation. He knows, that great organization knows, every man who has deliberately studied the subject must know, that a high protective tariff upon agricultural products means nothing at all to the producer, but everything to the manufacturer, who is entitled in consequence of the imposition to his compensatory duty; in other words, the right to ask and to receive twice the tariff protection that he otherwise would enjoy. That has cropped out in this bill. The compensatory duty appears here for the manufacturer of woolen goods and for the manufacturer of cotton goods; and they are to-day quietly rubbing their hands in satisfaction and hoping for the passage of this bill, since theirs will be the victory and not the farmers and the wool-growers, who seem to think—and it is a very natural thought, for they have been so taught—that if the Government will only go into partnership with them to the full the whole country will prosper in general while they will flourish in particular.

Mr. President, the legislative history of the United States has disclosed a constant succession of tariff agitation and antitariff agitation. These have succeeded each other like the tides of the ocean, and I presume will continue so to do as long as this great economic question is involved in politics and forms a line of division between political parties.

If we can use the power of taxation to this extent we can use it whenever a class is strong enough to insist upon the imposition of a tax of any kind upon the property holders of the United States for their benefit. That will be tested out successfully in the next Congress, when the bonus bill, which will increase the national debt to the extent of at least three and a half billion dollars, will be enacted and taxes will be levied upon one class of people solely, openly, and unblushingly for the benefit of another class of people, and that in a country which pretends at least to be one of liberty, equality, and justice. The time is coming—and it is the only bright ray I see in this line of economic legislation—when everybody will be protected against everybody else, and protection will thus defeat itself, because there will be no longer any class to be robbed for the benefit of some other class.

The Republican Party has won the greatest political victory in the history of the country. Flushed with success and power, in absolute control of all the departments of the Government, it proposes—and properly so from its standpoint—to rectify all the evils of commercial conditions by the enactment of a general tariff law, doubtless going far beyond the standards of the Payne-Aldrich law, which, instead of tempting prosperity, will only increase the burdens now weighing business and industry and enterprise to the very earth.

These things, Mr. President, can not be done with impunity. The history of the United States demonstrates that no political party is in so much danger as when it seems to be absolutely supreme. From the good days when Franklin Pierce, in 1852, was by an overwhelming vote elected President of the United States, down to the close of this administration, which carried three-fourths of all the States in 1916, and is now about to ex-

pire, the unbroken course of history reveals that each of the great parties so coming into power has incurred the resentment of the populace, which have in turn passed them into the oblivion of the immediate future. That was a profound reflection of Anne of Austria to Cardinal Mazarin many years ago, when in the course of a controversy she said, "My Lord Cardinal, God does not pay every week or month, but He always pays some time." We can not outrage economic laws by artificial and disturbing legislation without sooner or later confronting the consequences and paying their penalties.

This conference report will soon be adopted. It will then go to the President for his approval or, at this late hour in the session, for his pocket veto.

I know, Mr. President, and I betray no confidences in so declaring, that a very large proportion of the Members of the House and the Senate who support this bill will look upon the President's disapproval with almost as much satisfaction and with a deeper sigh of relief than will be expressed by anybody on this side of the Chamber. The fate of the bill will be in his hands; and he can not better crown his eight years of splendid public service, for which, in due time, posterity will give him credit, than by sending this bill back to the House of Representatives bearing the stamp of his disapproval.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have never attempted to suggest to the Senate what the action of President Wilson would be upon this bill. A great many Senators on the other side, and possibly some few on this side, have assumed that because he belongs to the Democratic Party he will necessarily veto any bill that smacks of protection; but I can not forget, and I doubt very much if the President will forget, that he is not the President of the Democratic Party alone. So long as he holds his position, he is the President of the United States—President of the States of North Dakota and Minnesota and the entire Northwest, just as much as he is the President of New York or New Hampshire or South Carolina.

That being the case, I have confidence that whatever the President does he will do according to his best judgment as the President of the United States. I do not know what his information may be with reference to the conditions in the Northwest at this time. If he is as uninformed of the conditions of that section as is the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses], he may veto this bill without any further consideration. But assuming that he understands the situation where in a single purely agricultural State 35 banks have gone to the wall in the last month, and assuming that he understands the critical situation in those States, I still have hope that he will look at this bill as an emergency measure, and that just before we begin to get ready for the planting of the next crop he will, by signing this bill, give an encouragement to the entire Northwestern section, that they may have some hope for the future of their industries that will justify them in continuing.

I hope before the President signs or disapproves this bill some one will bring to his attention, if it has not already been brought to his attention, the actual condition of the Northwest and the farming section of my State and eastern Montana and Idaho and other sections of the Northwest, and of those sections that have been engaged in raising sheep. If he understands that situation, I will trust to his heart and his conscience to approve this bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, as a Democrat I have a good deal of respect for the legitimate Republican doctrine of protection. Something can be said in its favor. It presents an issue which fairly divides honest opinion in this country. In my judgment, however, this bill does not represent an honest effort at protection.

I sympathize with what the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] says concerning the hardships of the wheat raisers in his State. I sympathize with them because I know from the evils that wheat raisers in Nebraska contend with that there are serious conditions, but I know absolutely that no wheat raiser in his State and no wheat raiser or corn raiser in my State is suffering from any condition which by any possible stretch of the imagination can be cured by erecting a tariff barrier against imports or by imposing a tariff on the products which the producers of my State and of his State raise.

I can not look upon this bill as anything less than an attempt to pass off a gold brick on a class of agriculturists in the West and the South who are suffering from hard times. It is an attempt, apparently purely political, to make propaganda at this session, not to enact a tariff bill for the benefit of the farmers, because no one supposes for an instant that this bill is to be enacted. It is an attempt by congressional action to suggest an argument to the agricultural classes that a protective tariff would be good for them in order that at the next session they may look with complacency upon an attempt which is to be made to impose high or prohibitory duties upon manufactured goods which they must purchase.

Mr. President, the farmers of my State can not be deceived by any such effort. The farmers of my State who raise wheat know that this country raises every year much more wheat than it can consume, and that it is a steady exporter of wheat to other countries. They know that the small quantity which comes into this country from Canada comes here only on its way to the markets of the world, and that it has absolutely no effect upon the American price for wheat. If the wheat that is raised in Canada does not come to the American markets on its way to the European markets, it will go directly to Liverpool and our American wheat will meet it in Liverpool.

The farmers of my State know that last year this country raised a crop of wheat amounting to something like 800,000,000 bushels, and that approximately a third of that crop has been or is being exported to Europe. They are not alarmed by the fact that some 35,000,000 bushels of wheat have come here from Canada, because they know that we have exported already up to the first of this year something like 220,000,000 bushels of wheat. They know that the price of wheat in the United States is regulated by the supply and price of wheat in Liverpool and in other foreign markets, and they are not alarmed over the 35,000,000 bushels of wheat which comes here, which pass through our mills or pass over our railroads to the ports of export in this country on their way to the great markets abroad.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Assuming the argument of the Senator from Nebraska to be sound, there are, nevertheless, a great many farmers in the West who entertain a different view. The question which I desire to ask the Senator, however, is this:

If it be true that this bill will not in any way affect the price of wheat, it can not, as suggested by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] a few moments ago, have the effect of raising the price of breadstuffs so far as that particular feature of the bill is concerned, can it?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. A tariff upon the small amount of wheat that is imported here?

Mr. BORAH. Yes. I say, if as the Senator says it does not change the price of wheat, if it does not give any protection to the American wheat grower because his market is controlled by the markets of the world, then the mere fact of laying this duty on it would not raise the price of breadstuffs?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think not. I think it is a farcical attempt. It is simply an attempt to lead the wheat raiser to believe that there is a virtue in protection of which he can get the benefit. There is not any. The American wheat raiser can not by any means secure any benefit from protection. The American manufacturer can, and in order to make the American wheat raiser content when the Republican program is adopted for a protective tariff on manufactures this attempt is now being made in Congress to win over the American wheat raiser to the idea of a protective tariff for manufacturers by giving the farmer a gold brick.

What is true of wheat is true of corn. Our production of corn is something like 2,500,000,000 bushels a year, and the exports during last year were something like 33,000,000 bushels. The export of last year's crop is still going on, but there were 33,000,000 bushels exported last year, and yet because 3,000,000 bushels were imported into this country the corn producer is offered the gold brick of a protective tariff of 15 cents a bushel upon imported corn.

Now, I do not know how it is with the corn producer in other States, but the corn raiser in Nebraska is too intelligent a man to be deceived by that argument. You are not going to convert the corn producer of Nebraska to accept the protective tariff by offering him a protective duty on the little bit of corn that dribbles into the United States from other countries. He knows that we produce all the corn we need and consume. He knows that we have an exportable surplus, and do export it, and he is not afraid of the few bushels of corn coming from any other country to the United States.

So I repeat, Mr. President, this is not an attempt to enact legislation, because no one believes that this bill is to pass, and no one has believed at any time that it was to pass. You have simply been taking up the time of the House and the Senate for the sake of seducing the agricultural sentiment of the country into an acquiescence later on of a protective tariff for the benefit of the industries of the country at the expense of the agricultural classes.

Mr. President, there is a side to this to which I think people in this country should give some attention. For two years now the United States has been confronted with a very serious situation. We have a great surplus of exportable products from our

mines and our fields and our manufacturing interests. The difficulty we have found and the difficulty we will find, in exporting that surplus, is the difficulty of securing pay for it. During the last two years our exports to Europe have amounted to something like eight thousand million dollars per year, and our imports to five thousand million dollars per year. In other words, Europe, anxious as her people are to secure our raw materials and to secure some of our manufactured goods, has not been able to send to us the products of her making to pay for what she needs. She has only been able to send us five thousand million dollars' worth a year, although she has taken from us eight thousand million dollars' worth a year.

Europe would take a great deal more than eight thousand million dollars a year of our products if she could pay for them. She has not been able to pay for them with her own products, she can not pay for them in gold, and the result has been that something like three thousand million dollars a year difference has been made up by buying from us on time.

Mr. President, the time is approaching when Europe can not buy from us on credit. The time is approaching when Europe, if she can not pay for our products in products of her own, will be compelled to reduce her purchase of our products. It is here already. Already we are suffering in this country from the fact that Europe is not able to take over the products of ours which we are desirous of selling. We have a great depression in cotton, a great depression in copper, a great depression in our manufacturing industries, a depression in agricultural products, and a depression in cattle, because we can not sell the surplus.

Now, it is proposed seriously, and at the next session of Congress it will be proposed practically, to erect tariff barriers against Europe, and make it more difficult than ever for Europe to send us her products. Do Senators realize that that means a restriction on our exports, a greater depression in our industries, a protracted depression in our agricultural products? Mr. President, instead of erecting tariff barriers against Europe, we ought to be devising ways and means to permit Europe to pay for the surpluses we have in this country with the things she can sell to us.

The credit on exports has been stretched to the limit. Three thousand million dollars of credit we gave Europe last year, the difference between what we sold to her and what we bought from her. Three thousand million dollars of credit we gave to Europe the year before, the difference between what we sold to her and what we bought from her. That credit has resulted in stretching the credit in our banks. That expanded credit has made interest rates high to borrowers in this country. The credit of our banking institutions and of our financial institutions generally has been stretched in order that Americans might sell to Europe on credit because there is a shortage of imports. How long can that continue?

So I say, Mr. President, instead of proposing to erect barriers against imports from Europe, we should be promoting imports from abroad in order that we may export abroad, and that issue is one of the issues which will come before Congress at the next session.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. By the argument the Senator is making I am reminded that we find ourselves building an expensive merchant marine to bring products into this country and erecting a tariff wall to keep them out.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Very true. That is the inconsistent attitude we are in—taxing the American people to build ships in order that commerce of this country may be carried and proposing to cut down that commerce. At this very moment the commerce of the United States is on the decline from lack of imports.

In January of this year our imports were smaller than for any month during the last three years. Our imports last month were \$209,000,000. For January a year ago they were \$470,000,000. Our exports also, in consequence, inevitably, declined nearly a hundred million dollars, and we are confronted at the present time with the inevitable decline in the foreign commerce of the United States, because Europe is not able to buy our products and pay for them, either in her own products or in gold, because she has no gold, and she has been borrowing of us about to the limit; and yet it is seriously proposed now to erect a tariff barrier against the products of Europe which might otherwise come here to pay for the products which we sell to Europe.

Mr. President, it is worth while noting the condition of our neighbor on the north—Canada. It is solemnly proposed in this bill to erect a tariff barrier against the small quantity of wheat which comes from Canada to the United States. The fact is that the Canadian commerce is a highly valuable commerce to the people of the United States. We sell to Canada every year something like \$800,000,000 of our products. We buy from

Canada only about one-half that quantity, and now it is proposed, by a barrier on Canadian wheat, to prevent that wheat coming in, and I suppose there will be presented at the next session of Congress tariffs on others of the products of Canada, so as to make trade with Canada difficult for the United States.

I simply want to voice my protest against this bill in the hour of its final passage, and in closing to condemn it, as I did at the beginning, as a gold brick—not a serious attempt to pass legislation but as an attempt to gold brick the agriculturists of the West into the false impression that they will derive some benefit from the protective-tariff scheme.

Mr. President, it is too late. The West opened its eyes a number of years ago, and one of the important influences in bringing about that era during which the western agricultural States voted the Democratic ticket and put Democrats in office was the fact that the West became convinced that its interest did not lie in the direction of a protective tariff.

MILITARY NOMINATIONS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the President of the United States has sent in additional nominations affecting the Army of the United States, and I therefore ask unanimous consent, as in open executive session, that there be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs all nominations for original appointments in the Army, all nominations for transfer from one branch of the service to another, and all nominations for confirmation, below the grade of brigadier general. This is the class of nominations which the Senate upon prior occasions has unanimously permitted to be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Jones of Washington in the chair). Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

Mr. McKELLAR. Those are not the same nominations we were discussing on Friday?

Mr. WADSWORTH. These are additional names sent to the Senate, and I am simply asking that they be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to their going to the committee, but I want to say that so far as the captains, first lieutenants, and second lieutenants who are to be promoted are concerned I have objection, and I think this is just as good a time as any to state to the Senate my objection.

But I will stop long enough to let the nominations indicated by the Senator from New York go to the committee, and then I want to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and the nominations will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in reference to the nominations for promotion from the grades of second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and captain, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the present law in reference to promotions.

Under the construction of the Army reorganization act by the War Department men appointed from the emergency forces in the ranks of colonel, lieutenant colonel, and major are appointed with regard to their respective grades, but under another provision of the act captains and lieutenants are thrown in hodgepodge and are appointed indiscriminately, without respect to their grades. I read from page 16 of the act as to captains and lieutenants:

Third, captains and lieutenants of the Regular Army and Philippine Scouts, originally appointed since April 6, 1917, shall be arranged among themselves according to commissioned service rendered prior to November 11, 1918, and shall be placed at the foot of the list as prepared to this point.

The effect of the holding of the department as to this provision is that all captains, first lieutenants, and second lieutenants are placed in one body, when it comes to promotions on the single list, and the captain, first lieutenant, or second lieutenant who has the longest commissioned service is held to be entitled to promotion ahead of the higher officer who has not had so long a service. Results of test examinations held with such care last summer are without force or effect. If a second lieutenant had one day's longer service than a captain, he is promoted over the captain.

To illustrate what I mean, suppose two men in the emergency forces have applied for commissions in the Regular Army. One was appointed a captain on the 2d of July, 1917, and the other a second lieutenant on the 1st of July, 1917. The one who was appointed a captain, let us assume, was promoted to major, then to lieutenant colonel, and then to colonel, if you please, in the emergency forces, all because of distinguished service. The man who was appointed on the 1st of July as a second lieutenant remained a second lieutenant all the way through the emergency.

He did not go up; he was not promoted. He did nothing to deserve promotion. After the war was over the colonel in the emergency forces and the second lieutenant in the emergency forces both appeared before one of the boards constituted under this act in order to receive appointments in the Regular Army. The four boards who examined this colonel and this lieutenant, after a careful examination, determined that the colonel was entitled to a captaincy and that the lieutenant was entitled to a second lieutenantancy. In that state of affairs those appointments were made and have been heretofore confirmed by the Senate. Now it is proposed to appoint the second lieutenant to a captaincy.

Under the holding of the department this second lieutenant, who has already received his commission, is promoted over the captain on the single list and will receive his majority before the previously appointed captain. I do not think that is fair. It is not fair to the men who have stood the examinations. They were asked to stand examinations for these appointments. Four boards passed upon their qualifications—education, fitness, ability, and moral character—and under this ruling of the department the man who was appointed a captain will find himself below the man who was appointed a second lieutenant. There is nothing fair about that. It means a demoralization of the forces.

I find this peculiar condition of affairs in regard to these appointments. I do not know whether this last batch of nominations will complete the list or not, but the Army will have a general and, I hope, two lieutenant generals, a great many major generals, a great many brigadier generals, a great many colonels, a great many lieutenant colonels, a great many majors, and a great number of captains, but it will not have any lieutenants. We will have a lieutenantless Army. There are now practically no lieutenants in the Army. Second lieutenants under this ruling are being appointed to captaincies without any examination, except the physical examination. They are promoted right over the first lieutenants, provided the second lieutenants have had longer commissioned service. Such action is intolerable. It is not fair or just to the men who have stood the examination and it is not in my judgment in accordance with what was intended by Congress.

Mr. President, in order to correct the injustice, I introduced some time ago an amendment which would require the appointments or promotions to be made within the respective grades of captain, of first lieutenant, and of second lieutenant. I tried to get the amendment agreed to in committee when the Army bill was up for consideration and I was unable to do it. In that situation there is only one thing I can do and that is, when the nominations come in promoting second and first lieutenants over captains in the way I have stated, to object to their promotion. As I understand, it now requires unanimous consent for officers to be promoted, and I propose to withhold my consent to their promotion, believing that it is right. Ordinarily I would not do this, but I can not bring myself to agree to the great injustice thus proposed to be done to many officers and the Army itself.

I make this statement about it for the purpose of calling the attention of the Senate to the rule of promotion as announced by the department and to the injustice of the situation and the injustice of the interpretation of the Army reorganization bill.

Before I close I wish to call attention to the method by which it can be corrected. I have offered an amendment which proposes to strike out the third clause of paragraph (d) of section 24a, and insert in lieu thereof the following paragraph that I read a little while ago:

Third. Captains and lieutenants of the Regular Army and Philippine Scouts originally appointed since April 6, 1917, shall be arranged among themselves in their respective grades according to commissioned service rendered prior to November 11, 1918, and shall be placed at the foot of the list as prepared to this point.

Mr. President, the emergency officers who stood these examinations were not told by the department that if or when they were appointed captains they would be subject to have all first and second lieutenants promoted over them who had a longer commissioned service. If this rule was going to be made by the department, it ought to have been made known to them. Many officers who accepted captaincies did so, of course, on the theory that when promotions came they would be entitled to them and that those who had won only first or second lieutenantcies would not be promoted over them. I have no doubt that many of these men accepted captaincies who would not have accepted them if they had known that first and second lieutenants having longer service would be promoted over them. Senator CAPPEN the other day told of a captain that would have 1,100 other captains, first, and second lieutenants promoted over him under this holding of the department. Further, Mr. President, there should not be one rule of promotions applied to colonels, lieutenant colonels, and majors, and another and different rule ap-

plied to the promotions of captains, first lieutenants, and second lieutenants.

If promotions were thus to be made, due notice ought to have been given to that effect when the examinations were held. There should have been no separate examinations for captains or first and second lieutenants. I have no doubt many men were selected as second lieutenants who would not have been appointed to captaincies at all. Indeed, I know of such cases. And yet under this ruling of the department all first and second lieutenants were in substance made captains and their commissions are proposed to be dated back to July 1, 1920. The result is that we have, as I stated before, practically no lieutenants in the Army. We had better save a few of these first and second lieutenants for emergencies. My distinguished and esteemed friend from Minnesota, Mr. NELSON, stated when the Army reorganization bill was up last spring that it provided for a top-heavy Army. I do not know what he would have said about it if he had known that under it, in less than a year, we were to have no lieutenants in the Army at all. In the late war with Germany the lieutenants of the Army did wonderful fighting, and yet our present Army will have no lieutenants if these promotions are permitted. The result is, Mr. President, I shall object to the promotions of these first and second lieutenants to captaincies, and let the matter go over to another session, when we can remedy this defect. It should be remedied before we endorse it by confirmation of these promotions.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. Inasmuch as we are discussing something that is not before the Senate at present, and inasmuch as there will be ample opportunity later to discuss that matter, and as we have been expecting a vote upon the conference report on the tariff measure for some little time, may I ask the Senator if he will not permit us to proceed and get a vote upon the conference report at this time?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am going to take only a few moments more. I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota that there is a difference between the emergency tariff bill and the question of the promotion of these officers. Some of the second lieutenants are going to be promoted 1,100 numbers ahead of those who made a better showing and stood a better examination than the lieutenants and who have become captains through examinations. The Senator's tariff bill, which I know is important to him, is a matter of no concern to the country, because the country knows it is not going to become the law. In going through the form of passing his tariff bill we are dealing with something that is not important practically, because everybody knows that as soon as it is passed—and it is going to be passed—the President is going to veto it, to the great gratification of a large number of our Republican friends. We are talking about a vain and idle thing when we discuss the emergency tariff bill, and the session is drawing to a close. We are simply wasting the time of the Senate in considering it. Many Senators on that side are holding their nose when they vote for it. I have postponed making this statement to the Senate about these promotions in the Army for a number of days, hoping to have an opportune time; but it seemed that it did not come, and I thought the matter ought to be submitted to the Senate. It is a live, active question and ought to have consideration, while the Senator's bill is dead before it is passed.

Mr. President, I do not believe the Senate will agree to the confirmation of second lieutenants who have been promoted over first lieutenants in the first place and captains in the second place. It is wrong in principle and policy. I am sure the Senate will not do it.

For the reasons which I have called to the attention of the Senate I have taken a little of the valuable time of the Senator from North Dakota in making the statement to the Senate, because it is important.

I apologize to him for interrupting the consideration of his bill, and would not have done it if I had not considered it under the circumstances of much more importance.

PROPOSED REFERENCE OF POST-OFFICE NOMINATIONS.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I desire just a moment to ask unanimous consent for the reference of certain appointments that have been made by the President. I refer to the list of former service men and widows of former service men who have been appointed as postmasters and whose names are now before the Senate, and which list appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5. I ask unanimous consent, as in open executive session, that the nominations be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. McCUMBER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

EMERGENCY TARIFF—CONFERENCE REPORT.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I stated some days ago why I had supported the bill which is now before the Senate of the United States as an emergency tariff bill, and I do not intend to make any remarks upon the merits of the bill as a whole; I think it would be a consumption of time to no purpose; but I do wish to express my disappointment at the action of the conference committee to which the bill was referred. I of course do not intend to express any doubt that the conferees on the part of the Senate performed their duty as conscientiously as they could have done, but the result is that the report which is now before the Senate has eliminated the provision for a modest tariff upon hides.

The bill as originally framed by the House and which came to the Finance Committee of the Senate made no provision for a duty upon meats or upon hides. There was no attempt made to take care of the great cattle industry of the country, an industry to which we look for the principal meat products of the country. We all realized that the industry had suffered greatly by reason of the great depression in the price of cattle and of meat products; so when the matter came to the Senate Committee on Finance an amendment was proposed placing a duty of 2 cents per pound upon the importation of fresh meats. A very modest duty of 15 per cent ad valorem was likewise suggested upon hides, with the hope that if any of the industries were to be benefited by the passage of the bill that industry would at least receive some slight benefit from the measure.

When the matter came into the Senate an amendment was proposed placing a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem upon advanced hide products. That amendment, as I understand, was offered by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge]. It was agreed to by the Senate, but apparently the Senator from Massachusetts misjudged the situation and found that there was already a tariff of 30 per cent ad valorem upon manufactured leather products and that his amendment would be in the nature of a reduction. Therefore when the matter came before the conferees it was thought that the way to handle it, rather than to do anything that might at all mitigate against the interest of the manufacturers of hides, was to strike out the duty on hides altogether, as well as the 10 per cent ad valorem duty upon manufactured products.

The result is that the action of the conference committee takes away any duty upon hides and leaves the situation as it is at the present time, with an ad valorem of 30 per cent upon the manufactured product. It has been stated on the floor of the Senate this morning that that duty upon hides was stricken out in conference because it was alleged that the packers of the country practically controlled the hide industry; that they purchased practically all of the hides that went into the market of the country; that they purchased the cattle which carried the hides, and the price of which would enter into the sale of the animal at the packers' market.

But I desire to call attention to the fact that that can not be so, because there is left in the bill, according to the conference report, the duty of 2 cents a pound upon fresh meat, and if the packers controlled the hide industry of the country they controlled the meat industry, and whereas the importation of hides is a comparatively small matter, yet the control of the meat products of the country affects vitally every household in the land, and they have left in the bill the tariff of 2 cents a pound upon meats. If the packers control the one industry they control the other. I submit that there is absolutely no reason why there should be retained in the bill the provision of 2 cents a pound upon meat and the provision of 15 per cent ad valorem upon hides stricken out, because if the argument of the packers applies to the hides it applies to the meats.

A member of the conference committee has stated on the floor this morning that the reason why the tariff upon hides was stricken out was because under the rule the conference committee could not increase the compensatory duty upon the manufactured product. It is true that striking out the 10 per cent ad valorem amendment upon manufactured products would have left the tariff upon the manufactured products still 30 per cent, notwithstanding the fact that the manufacturers of hides had such a controlling influence, at least with the House conferees, that they were able to strike out absolutely any provision for a tariff upon hides. They wanted to get the hides free and yet retain the 30 per cent ad valorem duty upon the manufactured products.

I wish to say to those Senators who have been influential in this respect that the time has come when the people of the country are not going to permit this high tariff for the benefit of any particular section of the country. They are not going to levy a high tariff upon the manufactured products and leave out a tariff upon the raw materials. I wish the people of the western country to understand that cattlemen all over the country, the man who takes the hides to the markets from any section of the country, under the provisions of the conference report will be deprived of the benefit of any kind of a tariff, because under the rule the conferees could not increase the compensatory duty upon the manufactured product, although the manufacturers are now reaping the benefit of a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem. I think the people of the country should understand this fact.

I am going to vote for the conference report because I believe there is a great emergency in the country. I can not say that this bill will do the many good things that have been predicted for it, but if it will do any good I believe it ought to be passed in order to help relieve the very depressing situation which prevails throughout the country. I express the hope that when the bill shall pass, as I believe it will, the President of the United States will approve of it, so that the country may at least psychologically reap some benefit from this legislation, which, at least, is proposed in the attempt to relieve a very deplorable situation.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. If I correctly understand the Senator's able speech the conferees have in their report eliminated the duty upon hides?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is quite true.

Mr. ASHURST. And have not made a corresponding reduction in the duty on the manufactured article?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Under the existing law there is a duty of 30 per cent upon the manufactured article. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] proposed an amendment to the bill when it was previously in the Senate placing a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem upon the manufactured products. That amendment was agreed to by the Senate, but, apparently, he later found that that would put the manufacturers in a less advantageous position than they now are, so the conferees eliminated the amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. In other words, the Senator from Massachusetts evidently intended that the 10 per cent duty should be in addition to the present 30 per cent duty, but he left out "in addition," thereby reducing the duty, contrary to his expectation, from 40 per cent to 10 per cent.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, those on both sides of the Senate and the House of Representatives who have voted for this bill, in my judgment, have voted for it upon the hypothesis solely and only that it was a farmers' emergency tariff bill. I am sure that most of the Members of the House and of the Senate who have voted for the bill believe that its psychological effect might be considerable in stimulating the agricultural industries of our country which already have been too much discriminated against. The bill still contains some value, but I regret and deplore—I will not characterize it as bad faith, for that would be unparliamentary—the circumstance if in this, which is supposed to be a farmers' bill, a bill solely and only to encourage and stimulate agriculture, they have done that which for 100 years has disgraced the annals of our legislative halls, to wit, kept a protective tariff on the manufactured article and retained the products of the farm, the field, and the ranch on the free list.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. ASHURST. I want first to finish my statement.

Those Senators who have voted for the bill may be justified in now voting for the conference report, but I wish it understood, so far as my vote is concerned, that I regret the alteration by the conferees. The bill yet has some effect for good in stimulating and encouraging our agricultural industries, but discriminations must not continue. If this be a sample of what Senators on the other side are going to give us in the tariff bill yet to come, if in the future they are going to give us a tariff bill which puts the manufactured article under a high protective tariff and places the products of the farm, the field, and the ranch on the free list, then again will their party be hurled from a towering eminence to the place where it was hurled in 1912.

I thought the time had come in America when the Republican Party, or at least the Democratic Party, had learned that a country can not subsist with such a gross discrimination written into its laws as the placing of manufactured leather which goes into boots and shoes under a high protective tariff and the raw material, which the farmer and the ranchman produces, on the free list.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Arizona is not contending, is he, that the conference committee has done anything with reference to the Underwood-Simmons tariff law?

Mr. ASHURST. I contend that the conferees took the duty off hides.

Mr. McCUMBER. We have not interfered with that. The emergency tariff bill as it passed the other House contained nothing with reference to hides. The Senate put a compensatory duty on hides, but the House Members would not agree to it, and we thought it was better to put the bill through even with that left out, keeping the law unchanged as provided in the Underwood-Simmons tariff law, than to have the bill fail of passing the two Houses. That is practically all there was to it. I am as strongly in favor as is either the Senator from New Mexico or the Senator from Arizona of a duty on hides, because they are the farmer's finished product; they are not raw material to him; but we have not time to further consider that matter now in the closing days of the session. When, however, we frame our next tariff law, Senators will find that I shall stand pretty firmly for a protection on hides as well as on meat.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senator from New Mexico will further yield to me, all I want to ask of any Senator is this: "Are you for protection?" "Very well; then your foot may be upon the unriven rock as a philosophy of government, providing you extend the burdens and benefits to all alike." "Sir, are you for tariff for revenue only?" "You may plant your foot on the unriven rock as a philosophy of government if you raise revenue from the products of the farm, the field, and the ranch just as you raise revenue from the products of the factory." "Sir, are you for that absurd, hazy, nebulous thing which exists in the imagination only of theorists—free trade?" "You may even make a fair argument for that absurd doctrine if you believe in free trade in all things"; but how, in the name of fairness, how in the name of conscientious legislation, any Congress, now or hereafter, could put the manufactured article under the protection of a high tariff duty and then say to the farmer and the ranchman, "Sir, you must compete with the cheap foreign markets in order that our home factories may obtain their raw material cheaper."

When I first came to the Senate I was not much of a compromiser; I demanded the whole loaf or none; but I have learned a vast deal of legislation; I have learned that legislation is not logical; 2 and 2 make 4, that is logical; but it is impossible to legislate logically; there must be give and take if you ever expect to get anywhere. You must be able to negotiate compromises; you must sometimes accredit the other fellow with at least a grain of wisdom or a small particle of information. So, deploring that the duty on hides has been eliminated, or that the Senate conferees yielded on that item, I expect to vote for the report.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, may I call the attention of the Senator from Arizona to what the conferees did, both as to hides and manufactures of hides?

Mr. ASHURST. So far as I am concerned, I will be glad to have the Senator do so, although the Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have no objection to the Senator from Texas making the statement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the conference report not only struck out the duty on hides but also the duty which the Senate added on hides in the various processes of manufacture, thereby not leaving any discrimination, so far as the conference report is concerned, in this particular measure.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is quite true, and I made a statement to that effect in the early part of my remarks; but it seems to me, in view of the peculiar conditions, that, when the manufacturer already has an ad valorem tariff of 30 per cent upon the manufactured product in any process of manufacture, including the cost of hides, labor, and everything else, if he found himself in this predicament, at least he might have com-

promised with his conscience by permitting the cattleman to have a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem on hides.

Mr. REED. Compromised his profits, not his conscience.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The suggestion has been made that the compromise should refer to profits only and not to conscience. I imagine that some manufacturers still have consciences, and they might reach some compromise of their conscience, but they have not done that; the duty on hides has been stricken out. I wish to say now that when we come to frame the regular tariff bill, if the manufacturers are going to be so insistent upon the preservation of their own profits, without regard to anybody else, they may meet with considerable trouble in framing tariff legislation at the next session of Congress.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment before he takes his seat?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. The matter could have been adjusted in conference so that the manufacturers of leather would have a compensatory duty of 200 per cent, but it could not be adjusted so that they would get a compensatory duty of 300 per cent. That was what they wanted, and because they could not get that the duty on hides was stricken out.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I am very glad the Senator, who is a member of the conference committee, has made that statement.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to say further a word of protest before this bill comes to a final vote. The bill is a repudiation of a great fundamental Democratic doctrine. Those Democrats who have given it their support now find, even before it has become a law, that their desertion of the Democratic faith has already placed them in a defenseless position.

The bill as reported by the conferees comes stripped of some of the important advantages they hoped to obtain for their constituents, while it retains all of the advantages the protected manufacturers had been granted. Thus early Democrats who have abandoned the faith find how dangerous it is to tamper with a principle and begin to realize the helplessness of their position.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Just a moment, the Democrats who have abandoned the old party faith for a temporary expedient are now driven into a corner by the representatives of the great manufacturers who have always profited by tariff legislation. Does the Senator from Arizona wish to ask me a question?

Mr. ASHURST. It will be so long that possibly I should not interrupt the Senator, but he has intimated that Senators who are supporting this bill are departing from the straight and narrow path of Democracy. Now, let us see in what respect—

Mr. REED. Does the Senator wish to ask me a question or does he desire to make a speech?

Mr. ASHURST. I want to engage the Senator in a colloquy, if he will permit, for two or three minutes.

Those of us on this side who are supporting the bill insist that it can not be democratic to grant favors to one set of citizens and deny them to others; that it can not be democracy to enact laws for the benefit of one citizen that do not apply equally to all citizens; in other words, we insist that the burdens and benefits of government must be distributed equally and alike to all.

Following that philosophy, we say if you be for free trade, should your mind be captivated by that impossible vagary, if you are honest, you will extend free trade to everything; if you be for protection, you will protect everything; if you seek revenue, sir, you will seek revenue from everything. What right have you as a Democrat to say we will replenish our Treasury by a duty upon this article, but not upon that? What right has a Republican to say, "We will protect this article, but not that?" What right has a wild-eyed free trader to say, "We will have free trade on this, but not on that?"

James Madison, a Democrat, who wrote the first tariff bill, who for eight years was President, and who during the eight years preceding that time was Secretary of State under Thomas Jefferson, was for a tariff on raw material; Jefferson, the father of the Democratic Party, was for a tariff on raw material; Andrew Jackson, who not only won with his sword the liberties of the people but sustained them as well with his pen, likewise was for a tariff on raw material.

Tariff duties on manufactured articles and free raw material that goes into the finished product is a heresy that has crept into the Democratic Party within the past 30 years. Call the roll of those who built up the Democratic Party; call the roll of those Democrats who for 50 years occupied the Presidency,

and it will be found that they were for a tariff on raw material if there were imposed a tariff on the manufactured articles. Call the roll of the immortal Senators and Representatives who have served their country and enriched the annals of the Democratic Party, and it will be found they were all for free trade for the finished product if there was to be free trade for the raw material. Protection for none or protection for all. Equal rights to all, special privileges to none. It is unjust and undemocratic to say to the farmer, "Sir, produce, produce, in a free trade unprotected market," and then say to the manufacturer, "You may sell in a protected market."

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for permitting this interruption. The Senator's Democracy is so unquestioned and his record as a Democrat is so unblemished that I fear his charge that we have departed from the faith may injure some of us, because when he announces the doctrine of Democracy all Democrats listen, knowing his splendid record in the past as a Democrat.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in answering "the question" just asked permit me to say that I have never achieved anything so satisfactory as to have inspired the remarkable specimen of eloquence with which the Senator from Arizona has just entertained, delighted the Senate, and enlightened the country.

I do not intend to review the history of the tariff question nor to engage in any discussion about what Mr. Madison or Mr. Jefferson may have said a hundred years ago. I should be quite willing to do so if the time of the Senate were not just now so precious.

If I know anything about Democratic doctrine, it is that the levying of a tax not to raise revenue but raise the profits of a favored class is wrong in principle and opposed to the fundamentals of the Democratic Party. Against that heresy Democracy has steadfastly stood since before the distinguished Senator from Arizona was born.

If I know anything about the philosophy of government as maintained by my party, it is that a law which takes the property of one citizen and gives it to another without compensation is an unjust law. That robbery is still robbery, although perpetrated under the form of law.

The Republican Party have held to the theory that it is justifiable to tax one citizen for the benefit of another. The Democratic Party have denied that doctrine in every platform, on every stump, in every forum, for the past 50 years. Any attempt by a Democrat, by verbal gymnastics, to avoid the consequences of a vote in favor of this Republican protective measure will not for a moment deceive the American people.

We have now a tariff which was levied for revenue purposes. Without claiming that it is perfect, its purpose was to raise revenue for the Government, and not to raise profits for the manufacturers. We have steadfastly so declared, and thus justified that law. It is proposed now to pass this bill, not for the purpose of raising revenue, but for the purpose of tariff protection. The argument that has been made in favor of the bill is that the farmer needs protection; that the bill is to shut out competition and raise the price of the farmer's product to him. We all know that it is not intended the bill will raise revenue for the Government.

What is the justification offered by Democrats who vote in favor of this bill? Is it not that we already have a tariff law upon the statute books; that it affords protection to certain manufacturers, and that therefore a vote in favor of this bill can be excused?

It merely equalizes the situation by extending protection to the farmer. The fallacy in this argument is that we are not now operating under a protective tariff. The law upon the statute books is not a protective measure but a revenue measure.

When the Democrats enacted it they distinctly disclaimed the doctrine of protection. Accordingly, those who now vote in favor of this bill, which is purely protective, can not justify themselves, for they are endeavoring to graft on a Democratic revenue law the Republican doctrine of protection.

The purpose is boldly declared to be to raise the price upon those commodities which are raised by the constituents of Senators who support this measure. Thus these gentlemen place themselves in the position of sanctioning protection.

How, then, can they be heard to object to a bill which will be speedily reported by the new Republican Congress and which will place high protective duties upon manufactured products?

Our friends on this side who support the present bill will be confronted by their own arguments, and, having voted for a protective tariff upon farm products, can not be heard to object to a tariff upon manufactured products.

The present law—which, as I have shown, is a revenue law—is wicked and unjust. The Senator assumes it to be a protec-

tive tariff law. "Therefore," says the Senator, "I insist on extending the robbery to cover my own people."

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I will yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator never believed in emergency legislation to meet emergency conditions?

Mr. REED. I shall discuss the emergency question in a moment.

Mr. MYERS. I will ask the Senator in that connection this question, the two together:

When the farmers of the West, who have for years combated droughts and high prices of all farm machinery and labor, last year made extraordinary efforts to put in a large wheat crop in response to the appeal to have America help feed the world, and produced that crop under enormous costs of labor and high-priced machinery, and have a part of it left over, does the Senator think it is right for them to be compelled to sell what wheat they have left at less than it cost them to produce it?

Mr. REED. I shall answer both of those questions in a moment. I prefer to wait a moment, until I arrive at that topic.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. REED. I can not answer three questions at once. I will yield to the Senator, though. I can not help but do that.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is undoubtedly one of the ablest men in debate in this country. I know him well enough to know that he wants to be fair. That is his impulse of heart and mind. I am only solicitous at this point that he state my position accurately, and I know the Senator did not intend to state it with inaccuracy a moment ago.

My position is simply this: If it be the policy of our Government to have protection, then I simply insist that protection must be extended to the products of the fields, farms, and ranches alike with the products of the factories. If the policy of our Government be simply a tariff for revenue only, then I insist again that the revenue must be raised from the products of the ranch and the fields just as it is raised from the products of the factories.

I repeat that if theorists again obtain control of the executive branch of the Government and they conclude to have free trade, then I shall insist, as I do in the case of protection and as I do in the case of tariff for revenue, that you must treat all alike—free trade for all if you desire free trade, protection for all if you have it for one; raise the revenue from all if you raise it from one. I simply wish to make my position clear.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator made his position clear. I think he made it clear in the first instance. I do not think I misrepresented him. I certainly did not intend to do so.

Mr. ASHURST. I know that.

Mr. REED. I repeat the Senator's position is that we now have a protective tariff, and that therefore we ought to extend it to include the farmer; but it happens that we have not a protective tariff, but a tariff that the Democrats passed and that they declared to be a revenue tariff; and on to that revenue tariff, which we have always declared to be honest, the Senator proposes to graft a thing that we have always declared to be dishonest and robbery under the form of law; namely, a tariff for protective purposes alone.

That is the trouble with the Senator's logic. Now, if the Republicans bring in at the next session a high protective tariff bill, and leave out the products of the Senator's State, he may then protest, as he now protests, that he has a right to put farm products in; but, living under a tariff for revenue, enacted by Democratic Congresses, signed by a Democratic President, which we have defended on the ground that it is a tariff for revenue only and not a protective tariff, he proposes to graft onto it as gross a piece of bald protectionism, baldly announced, as has ever been conceived. That is the fault in the Senator's logic. All of which leads me to the observation that poor Hancock was about right when he said that in his judgment the tariff was a local issue; in other words, that many men were in favor of a tariff when there was some benefit flowing to them or to their immediate constituencies.

Mr. ASHURST. I think I can improve on Gen. Hancock's epigram. Every man is a free trader after he gets his own interest protected.

Mr. REED. Very well; you can turn it around, and after all what have you said, except that every man is in favor of robbing if he is permitted to divide the loot. Such a man sits here not for the purpose of enacting legislation for the benefit of all the country. He regards legislation as a pork-barrel proposition. Out of that barrel he proposes to grab with both hands

everything that will be of particular benefit to his own community. He pursues his nefarious business in utter disregard of the interests of the rest of the country and of his high duties as a public servant. That is about as sordid and about as contemptible a position as a man can take. It is on the level with what was formerly claimed to be the case with reference to appropriation bills. As to them it was claimed that votes were mustered by giving to each Congressman some particular thing he wanted. In order to get that thing, it was asserted, he would vote for a thousand things he knew were unjust. He voted for a lot of loot because he could get some pork.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator does not apply that to me?

Mr. REED. No; I am merely replying to the Senator's argument. I am trying to show him where his enthusiasm leads him. Suppose the Senate and the House were to adopt that sort of philosophy, and were to boldly declare that they have proposed to have regard only to the interests of their own communities, which, being interpreted, is to have regard for their own political interests, so that they may continue to hold their seats—suppose all Members were to adopt that policy. Then every man in the Congress would be nothing but a public thief in a high place, engaged in the business of picking the pockets of the taxpayers through the agency of the Government of the United States. That is a fine philosophy to be announced as a rule of conduct.

I think I can answer, in my poor way, the question of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]. He inquired whether I believed there ever existed such a thing as an emergency, and whether we might not meet an emergency by proper legislation. Mr. President, of course emergencies arise, and when a real emergency does exist which can be met by proper legislation which will do justice to the rest of the country, we are all ready to provide the remedy.

What is this emergency, and how will any benefits accrue to the farmer? The whole world was upon a level of very high prices. Farmers, in common with others, were receiving high prices. Now the values of farm products all over the world have dropped. The farmer is suffering from that depression of prices. It is an economic situation existing not in the United States alone but in every country of the world.

Mr. MYERS. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the price of the farmer's wheat was fixed during the war, and he did not reap the enormous prices that people engaged in business or commerce did.

Mr. REED. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. MYERS. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I ask the Senator if he did not vote to give Mr. Hoover the powers under which he regulated the price of the farmer's wheat?

Mr. MYERS. I did—

Mr. REED. I ask him also if I did not stand here in the Senate within 3 feet of the Senator from Montana, hour after hour, and declare that Mr. Hoover would employ his powers to license grain dealers and millers to cut down the farmer's prices, and if, notwithstanding my warnings and my prophecies, the Senator did not vote to give Hoover those powers?

Mr. MYERS. I did; because I do not believe in profiteering by farmers or anybody else, and I voted to fix a price on the farmer's wheat, and I now vote to give the farmer justice and enable him to get a little more for his wheat than what it costs to produce it. I do not believe any producer of a necessity of life ought to be expected or compelled to receive less than what it costs to produce the article.

Mr. REED. In other words, the Senator is now ready to make restitution for his previous wrong.

Mr. MYERS. To give equality. I believe in equality.

Mr. REED. No; you can not give equality. Mr. President, as suggested by a Senator near me, cost is never the basis of market price; it is an incident. But let us see how you are going to give back to the farmer the thing which you took from him. When you denied him the markets of the world in which to sell—

Mr. MYERS. I want to remove from the Senator's mind a wrong impression of Mr. Hoover. I do not want the Senator to have any more wrong impressions than necessary, and I want him to know that Congress fixed the price of wheat and not Mr. Hoover.

Mr. REED. Congress never fixed the price of a bushel of wheat on earth.

Mr. MYERS. It passed an act fixing the price of wheat.

Mr. REED. No, it did not. Congress passed an act declaring that the Government would guarantee that wheat should not go below a certain price. This it did to encourage the farmer to plant heavily. But it never fixed the price at which the farmer should sell his wheat. Congress also gave Mr.

Hoover the power to license grain dealers and millers and to organize the Export Grain Corporation. The latter concern was organized and always completely dominated by Mr. Hoover. Not a bushel of wheat could be shipped abroad except it was sold to the grain corporation. Thus the export trade was placed completely under Mr. Hoover's control. Having the power to license the grain dealer and miller, Mr. Hoover, in cold and deliberate abuse of his authority to license, fixed absolutely the price he would permit the miller and grain dealer to pay for wheat. This price he fixed at the minimum price guaranteed by the Government.

The miller and grain dealer, together with the export corporation, controlled by Mr. Hoover, constituted the entire market in which grains could be sold. Over them all Hoover had the power of life and death. He could condemn them to ruin by the simple process of revoking their license to do business. Thus he deprived the farmer of any market for his wheat at any price except that which Mr. Hoover arbitrarily fixed.

It was a willful abuse of the licensing power granted by Congress, for that power was given solely to stop the cornering of the grain market and the hoarding of necessities. It was intended to punish those who were violating the laws of good morals and honest trade. It was intended to prevent a cornering of the market. Mr. Hoover employed it to corner the market and to arbitrarily fix prices. It was one of the baldest misuses of power ever known in the history of this or any other country.

I repeat that Congress never intended that Hoover should fix the price of wheat or the price of the other necessities of life. The debates in the Senate show this beyond peradventure or dispute. The whole course of the legislation and the public discussion at the time demonstrates the truth of what I have said.

But because Congress gave Hoover the right to license a miller in order to prevent profiteering, or over a grain dealer in order to prevent profiteering, he exercised that power of life and death for an entirely different purpose, namely, to regulate the price of wheat, and said to his licensees, "If you pay more than a certain amount for wheat, viz, the minimum price fixed by Congress, I will destroy your business." That is how the farmer's market was taken from him and the price of his wheat fixed.

Mr. MYERS. I suggest that it was the evident intention of Congress to give the farmer enough for his wheat to give him a reasonable profit, and no more.

Mr. REED. So long as the law was on the statute books, the farmers did receive the guaranteed price Congress had fixed. But during all that time Hoover deprived him of the higher price he could have obtained in the market. I deny the statement that Congress meant to fix the maximum price.

Mr. President, I do not want to stand here and engage in continued colloquies, although they are very interesting, because I do not want to hold the Senate away from the business which it has before it. I could talk this bill to death; two or three of us, at least, could talk it to death. But I am not disposed to take that course. I want, however, to finish my reply to the Senator from Montana. He proposes now that we shall make restitution to the farmer for what he says Hoover, or as he mistakenly puts it, Congress took from him during the war. He now declares that the farmer ought to have had the benefit of the open market of the world during the war, and that market having been denied him, we ought now make restitution. How is that to be done?

Mr. MYERS. If the Senator will permit, I do not say that. I say that the farmer should not have the privilege of profiteering, and that he should not now have imposed upon him starvation.

Mr. REED. The Senator's statement was that the farmer was not allowed to enjoy the profits of the war as others were, and that now he is entitled to this protection by way of compensation.

Let us analyze that. We speak about the farmer as though he were one man, and as though, having taken from this aggregate man the advantage of an open market and deprived him, let us say, of a billion dollars, we can now, by passing this law, put back the billion into this pocket. But it happens that the farmer is not one man; he is many millions of men. Some farmers raised wheat during the war, and some of them did not.

Many of those who did not raise wheat during the war are raising it now, and many of those who raised wheat during the war are raising something else, or they have quit farming. Many, in fact, are dead. You can not, therefore, by this bill restore the money to the pockets from which it was taken. You do not know how much any man has lost, nor who has lost it. The benefits of this bill will not flow to the man who lost the

money but to anybody who happens just now to be raising wheat. So that there is nothing in that argument. You can not carry it out. You do me no good, if I have been wronged by a law, by passing a law which may put something in the pockets of John Smith or William Jones, who were, perhaps, not even farmers during the war.

But, Mr. President, the real and substantial objection to this bill, outside of the great question of principle, is, as I started to say when I was interrupted, that when you undertake to play the game of protection with the manufacturers of this country, when you admit the principle of protection, you have put your head in the lion's mouth. There never has been a time when the New England manufacturer did not know how to take care of himself. I said the other day, and I employ the same expression, a New England manufacturer can go around one of our western statesmen just like a cooper around a barrel. He can "head him in" and close up the bung hole before the poor fellow knows what is being done to him.

The eastern manufacturer makes a scientific study of the tariff. He knows the markets. He understands the effect of competition. He carefully devises laws which will prevent competition and which will enable him to extort unnatural and unjust profits from the American people. He knows just how to frame the laws and the influence necessary to secure their enactment.

Some western and southern Democrats now propose to join these eastern protectionists. You are now asking exactly what they ask, namely, a law to shut out competition.

The difference between these Democrats and the eastern manufacturer is this: The eastern manufacturer contends for a law which he knows actually will shut out a vigorous and effective competition. The proponents of this bill are contending for a law which will not shut out competition, because the competition does not exist.

The eastern manufacturer contends for something substantial which will benefit him. You are contending for something unsubstantial and which will bring no benefit to the farmers you so valiantly profess to champion.

The American woolen manufacturer knows that if you take down the tariff wall he will be met immediately by large shipments of goods from abroad which will compel him to cut his prices to the American purchaser. But he also knows—and we ought to have sense enough to know—when we raise more wheat than can be consumed at home, and must therefore ship hundreds of millions of bushels abroad every year, that a law which proposes to tax wheat coming into this country can not materially advance the price of wheat.

We ought to have sense enough to know that when we accept a doctrine of protection on farm products which we do not import we at the same time commit ourselves to the doctrine of protection on manufactured products which we can import and ought to import. We ought to recognize the fact that a high tariff on manufactured goods will enrich the manufacturer and impoverish all the people, including the farmer. We ought to know that we can not raise the price of a farm product by prohibiting its importation when all the time we are producing a surplus which we are obliged to export.

Mr. MYERS. Whom will it hurt, as far as wheat is concerned?

Mr. REED. Very well, if the bill is not going to hurt anybody, then it is not going to help anybody. If it does not raise the price of wheat, then you are offering your farmer a paper resolution, written in fraud, conceived in chicanery, and put forth for the purpose of deception.

Mr. OVERMAN. A gold brick.

Mr. REED. Yes; a gold brick, a term that out West even we are beginning to understand, and incidentally they are beginning to understand the legislative gold brick quite as well as they do one made of metal.

Will some one tell me, when the farmer of this country is obliged to find a market abroad for 218,000,000 bushels of his wheat is he to be benefited by this bill? If the farmer does not sell this surplus abroad it will rot in his bin. How is he going to be materially benefited by a law that proposes to tax grain coming into this country?

Oh, but some one says "Grain does come in."

This last year there were some 30,000,000 bushels of grain, in round numbers, that came in, and that wheat competes with our wheat. It does not require much thought to discern the fallacy in that assertion. The Dominion of Canada and the United States of America are all on the same piece of land. There is nothing that divides them during a good part of the way but a red line drawn on the map. The same kind of land lies immediately to the north that lies immediately to the south of that line. The same kind of people live in both coun-

tries. The wages upon the Canadian farm are higher to-day than they are upon the American farm. Canada is an exporter of wheat, and the United States is an exporter of wheat. The wheat raised just north of the Minnesota line or the Dakota line competes with the wheat raised just south of it—where? Wherever they meet in the general markets of the world. Bushel for bushel, they compete with each other. There in that market they reach exactly the same level of price.

But Canadian wheat comes into our country notwithstanding that fact, and why? Simply because of two circumstances. First, railroad lines are so built that a part of the country of Canada is tributary to the immediate markets of this country. Just as wheat will flow from the State of Minnesota naturally to the great mills of Minnesota, just as it will flow from Dakota to the great mills of Minnesota, because that milling center is on the shortest and most direct route, so some of the wheat raised in Canada flowing along the natural lines of commerce comes to those great mills to be ground into flour.

There is another reason which I can illustrate. I happen to live, as Senators all know, in Kansas City, where we have the great wheat belt of Kansas and the great wheat belt of Missouri to draw from. We have at Kansas City a market which I think is the third or fourth of the entire country.

A vast volume of wheat is grown right around us, and yet while that is true we bring wheat from northern Minnesota and from Dakota, of and for what reason? Because they raise certain varieties of wheat that are slightly different from the wheat raised in Kansas and Missouri. The mixing of the different grades of wheat produces a better flour than the wheats will produce if ground alone. The same principle applies to the great mills of Minnesota. They have the wheat hauled to them from the South and they have wheat hauled from the North. Being a great center of production and milling, a large quantity of Canadian wheat has come in there purely for the economic reasons to which I have referred.

But what happens to that wheat? What is the result? The first result is a better grade of flour. The second result is that we do the milling in this country and we make the profit. The third result is that our people have whatever economic benefits flow from the highly sensible transaction.

But while we have brought in 30,000,000 bushels more of wheat than there was in this country, at the same time we had to send out 225,000,000 bushels. But what of it? It simply means that a little more of the wheat that is down near the seaboard will be shipped abroad, and in the long run the farmer's price will be fixed by the wheat that is sent abroad, just as it would have been had no wheat been imported.

If the Canadian wheat had not come here, we would have had to meet it in the foreign market and sold our grain there in competition with it.

The price of the surplus we send abroad will be affected by this competition, and the price of the surplus will fix the price in the domestic market.

Is any Democrat going to deny that? Must I stand and argue that to Democrats? There is not a Democrat here who has not stood on the platforms of his State and declared to the people that protection upon farm products is of no value, because we have a surplus to ship abroad, and that the price of the surplus fixes the price in the home market.

There is one thing we may accomplish. We may stop that wheat flowing naturally into our mills. We may make those mills bring wheat a little farther to their hoppers, and then when we get through with all of it we will find the price over in Europe has fixed the price here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And has increased the price of flour here.

Mr. REED. Yes; and we will probably have increased the price of flour here, because we will have interfered with the natural flow of the wheat along the most economical lines.

Mr. President, will some of the learned gentlemen take a pencil and figure out how they are going to sell 218,000,000 bushels of wheat over in Liverpool and then arbitrarily raise the price here 30 or 40 cents beyond the price received in Liverpool? Imagine yourself in the wheat business with a million bushels of wheat on hand, demanding, upon the passage of this bill, an arbitrary raise above the market price of 40 or 50 cents a bushel. Imagine everyone else in the country that has any wheat to ship abroad making the same demand. Of course, you would not send the wheat abroad, for you could not sell it there for a cent more than you can now. Then what would you do with it?

You would keep your wheat and after you had kept it awhile you would conclude you would rather have the foreign price than nothing and so you would sell at that price. If you were buying wheat, would you buy and pay 40 or 50 cents more than the price abroad with full knowledge that there was a

surplus of 225,000,000 bushels in the country that had to go abroad and be sold at the foreign price? You would know that if you bought and paid in excess of what you could get abroad, at the end of the season you would find yourself bankrupt because you would eventually be compelled to sell your wheat at the foreign level. That is all there is in the question.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, will the Senator let me make a suggestion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. REED. With pleasure.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the 25,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat had not been exported to this country and sold here in competition with our wheat, it would have been exported to Europe and there would have been sold in competition with our exported wheat.

Mr. REED. I tried to express the same idea, but I did not do so in so clear a way as the Senator has.

The fact is there are not enough mouths in this country to eat our wheat. There are mouths abroad that want it, but our wheat raisers have to sell their wheat over there in competition, so what are we offering the farmer? I do not wish to use harsh terms. I believe I will not say what I had in mind because it might sound cruel, but this I will say: This bill is an apple of Sodom, which will turn to ashes upon the lips of the American farmer.

Now, I am coming to the second point. I said that you were conceding the Republican doctrine and that you were going to pay the price. Before the bill got out of the committee the manufacturing protectionist had written his doctrine into it. He had assured himself of real swag in exchange for the farmers' imaginary swag. He is, in fact, the man who gets all the swag, because, as I have said, he is in competition with foreign manufacturers in this market. Observe when you put your little tariff here on wool and at the same time tell us that there is so much wool in this country that we can not use it for years—and if that is true no other wool can be shipped in here to amount to anything—how the manufacturer proceeded to take care of himself. He at once insisted upon a compensatory duty.

I read from the bill:

Manufactures of wool or hair of the kind provided for in paragraph 17 is the component material of chief value, 45 cents a pound in addition to the rates of duty imposed thereon by existing law.

It works in this way: A tariff of 10 cents a pound is placed upon raw wool. Does the manufacturer get a compensating tariff of 45 cents only on the manufactured wool? Not at all. He gets a tariff of "45 cents a pound on any article in which wool is the chief component of value." Accordingly he puts a small amount of wool in shoddy goods, 90 per cent of which in weight and material may have been made out of rags from the hospitals and pesthouses of the world. Of course, the 10 per cent of wool that he puts in to hold the stuff together until he can sell it to the unsuspecting citizen is the chief component in value, whereupon he collects 45 per cent not only on the wool that he has put into that garment but 45 per cent on the shoddy as well. With a countenance as impassive as the Sphinx, apparently as innocent as a babe, this gentleman puts this over. I will venture the assertion that the committee that wrote this "farmers' bill" did not know that it was providing the shoddy and the cotton that goes into goods are protected 45 per cent along with the wool.

The cotton raiser is here also seeking a duty on the only kind of cotton the production of which is monopolized—for the one grade of cotton that can be raised on only a few patches of ground in the United States. The great bulk of that cotton must be imported. That gentleman wants to be protected on his cotton. What is the price the American people must pay? A compensatory duty on cotton goods is to be paid by every man who wears a shirt, by every woman who wears a cotton dress. Every time we use any cotton for any purpose there will be some of this particular variety of cotton shown to be in the article, and we shall pay a tariff duty on all the manufactured cotton goods.

Also we are going to protect lemons. There are a few lemons imported into this country. I wish there were many more. I am getting a little tired of the Fruit Growers' Association of California, which has grown into a huge monopoly, fixing the price of lemons for the country. The duty on lemons, however, will not do any good out in Montana; it will not do any good out in Missouri.

The only place that is to be benefited by that duty is a little ground out in California. Everybody who drinks a glass of lemonade will have to pay that tax.

Now, Mr. President, just a final word. Where does this new doctrine bring us? The steel manufacturer claims he can not manufacture steel without protection; the copper manufacturer claims he can not manufacture without protection; the lead and zinc concerns cry for protection; the woolen and cotton goods men demand protection; the glass and queens ware men insist upon protection. Nobody can compete with foreign industry; everybody will be destroyed unless he is protected.

At last comes the American farmer—not the American farmer, but a few gentlemen who, I think, are mistaken in the idea that they represent him—and it is said he can not compete with the foreign producer. Yet we must sell something abroad.

Are we to erect a wall around our country and get rich by trading with each other? Why are we building vast argosies to ply between our ports and the ports of other countries if they are to carry nothing in their bottoms? The tariff advocate says, "You must bring nothing here, because it will destroy our industries." He further says, "We can not compete with foreign goods and products at home." Well, if we can not compete with them at home, how can we compete with them abroad? So the doctrine denies our ability to maintain ourselves in the world; to trade with anybody for anything under any circumstances. Is it proposed that we shall create a condition in this country where we shall have high prices here for American goods and those goods be sold at a low price to foreigners? Is the result of all our legislation to be that we shall fatten American concerns with high prices paid by the American people and let foreigners have the benefit of low prices?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, the Senator from Missouri recalls that the decadence of our old merchant marine began and continued with the operation of the protective tariff?

Mr. REED. Yes; I remember that; but the fact seems to have been forgotten by many.

Mr. President, I have taken too much time, but I want to express this thought in conclusion: I venture to make the prediction that the American protectionist will speedily undergo a change of heart. The time when we can talk about infant industries has passed. The infant of 50 years ago is the giant to-day standing astride the world. There is not in any country under the bending sky to be found such vast and invincible combinations of talent and of money and of energy and of labor as are possessed in the United States of America. Those who recently sought to build great fleets of vessels did it upon the theory that we were to extend our foreign trade; of gathering in other lands their dollars and bringing them here to add to our wealth. They were right.

The day has come when America must enter the markets of the world; when she must send her flag into every port; when American-branded goods must be found on the counters of every civilized people and even among savage tribes. The day has come when America must cease the policy of isolation, so far as our trade and commerce are concerned. We must be prepared to compete with the world; we must be prepared and we are prepared to go into the markets of the world and meet foreign competition.

We hear a reference to the old question of pauper labor. That is a theory that has been exploded in every Democratic platform. I feel this afternoon as though I were making a speech 15 years ago; then we had a party and a flag that we followed, and on that flag was branded, if not free trade, at least "tariff for revenue only."

We heard then about pauper labor. It was a cry that was not raised by labor but by the capitalists who wanted to profit from labor, and who in those days ground the face of labor with a cruelty that was indescribable. Even while they were talking about pauper labor at the same time they were importing under contract the cheapest labor they could get in all the world and putting it in their mills to take the place of the higher class of labor that existed in this country.

These were the men who raised the cry of pauper labor. Sir, we have all gone over the old beaten path of this argument until I hesitate to repeat it; but it seems that memories are short and it is being forgotten.

The fact is that it is clearly demonstrable that with modern machinery, backed by the brains of intelligent labor, the cost of labor in any given article is less in the first-class mills of the country than it is when the article is produced by the so-called pauper labor of foreign lands.

The only real competitor the United States has to-day is not the pauper labor of the world, but is the labor of the most intelligent and highly civilized countries of the world. Before we had

our disagreement with Germany it was German competition and English competition and French competition and Norwegian and Swedish competition and Dutch competition that our merchants and manufacturers had to fear; we never had to fear the competition of India. The lazzaroni of the earth produced with their fingers in the dull way their ancestors had produced a thousand years ago. Chinese manufacturers never came into competition with American manufacturers except as to a few choice silks, or something of that kind, which we could not produce in this country as skillfully as they could. Production to-day is not a question of labor so much as it is of machinery.

Between the day when our grandmothers sat at the spinning wheel and spun the flax and twisted the yarn and wove with their little hand looms the clothing for the backs of themselves and their children, when every hand had to be busy late into day and this, when a mighty factory is run by steam, and when a garment represented almost nothing but labor—between that day and this, when a mighty factory is run by steam, and when one employee can watch 10 or 12 machines that with numberless fingers and with the skill of magic do the work that a hundred or two hundred people formerly did—between these two extremes there is no comparison. There is no more comparison between the pauper laborer of the world, as a competitive factor, and our labor than there is between the uncivilized barbarian with his bow and arrow and the modern soldier with his deadly cannon and other instruments of destruction.

Just as the backward races can not barehanded charge in the mouths of our guns, just as they fall as the autumn leaves before the advance of our men equipped with modern arms, so economically they must give way. They are not and can not be our competitors.

Mr. President, I would not have spoken for more than five minutes if I had not been asked questions and led aside. This bill, Democrats, is a repudiation of our old doctrines. Sugar coat it as you may, it is the same old pill. I regret to see some of my brethren take a position in favor of it, because I know that their action will come home to plague us. I know that no man who votes for this measure can with consistency oppose the bill that I suspect is now being incubated in the offices of the great factories of the East—a bill that will be put over in the next Congress by the immense Republican majority that will assemble here after the 4th of March. But I am not going to stand and try to defeat the bill by a filibuster, although I am sorely tempted to do so. If it is to pass, let it pass, and perhaps our people will all the sooner find out how shallow is the pretense and how hollow the mockery of this so-called farmers' emergency tariff bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD obtained the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Ball	Hale	McNary	Smoot
Beckham	Harris	Moses	Spencer
Borah	Harrison	Myers	Stanley
Brandegee	Hefflin	Nelson	Sterling
Caldwell	Henderson	New	Sutherland
Capper	Hitchcock	Norris	Swanson
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Thomas
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Trammell
Culberson	Kellogg	Phipps	Underwood
Curtis	Kendrick	Pittman	Wadsworth
Dial	Kenyon	Poinexter	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Keyes	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	King	Ransdell	Warren
Elkins	Kirby	Reed	Watson
Fernald	Knox	Sheppard	Williams
Fletcher	La Follette	Shields	Willis
Gay	Lenroot	Simmons	Wolcott
Gerry	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.	
Glass	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	
Gooding	McKellar	Smith, Md.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate at any length in the discussion of the pending bill, nor do I intend to discuss the details of the measure; but this bill is of too great importance, too vital to the people of the United States, to go through and go to the President unless a serious protest is made against its passage on the fundamental principles of government and taxation, every one of which it violates within the folds of the bill.

I think it is conceded, and no man disputes these facts, that most, if not all, of the duties levied in this bill provide for a higher rate of taxation than any legislation that has been levied on similar articles at any time heretofore in the history of this Government. I think it is conceded and not disputed that the

real purpose of the bill is not to raise revenue for the benefit of the Treasury of the United States, but to establish an embargo on the importation of certain classes of foreign goods coming into this country by erecting a tax wall at the customhouse so high that it will cut off entirely the inward flow of commerce so far as most of the items named in the bill are concerned.

If that be true—and, so far as I know, it is admitted—then, Mr. President, the passage of this bill establishes a new era in the problem not only of levying taxes but of carrying on our foreign commerce so far as this Nation is concerned.

It establishes a most serious and dangerous precedent. It is true that one or two items in the bill will be revenue producers, such as sugar; but practically all the items have erected this wall so high that with the tax levied at the customhouse nothing can come in, it being the intention of the proponents of the measure to establish an embargo against foreign competition in order to pyramid prices at home. Of course as to how far the measure will be effective is dependent on many factors that can not be controlled by the bill. Some of the commodities in this bill have their prices fixed in the markets of the world, and others have their values fixed in the home market. On the one hand, for instance, is wheat, a world product, whose final market is established by the prices fixed on the Liverpool exchange; and on the other hand, within the folds of this bill, is corn, a domestic product, whose prices are fixed entirely within the domestic market. So, under those circumstances, no man can predict with safety whether the effect of this bill is going to be to stimulate prices all along the line or whether its effect will be otherwise; but we do know this: No matter what may be the ultimate effect of the bill, we do know the purpose for which it is proposed, and that is the establishment of an embargo on commerce by the hand of taxation—something that even the Republican Party never had the face to propose in the palmiest days of Republican protection.

Then, on the other hand, we have a new problem that is confronting the country—the problem of continuing our foreign trade, developing foreign markets for our excess production, and the collection of the debts due us by nations abroad.

For a quarter of a century or more after the close of the Civil War, during the period when a high protective tariff was maintained in this country, we were a debtor Nation; and notwithstanding the fact that that tariff had a tendency to keep out of this country foreign goods, yet it could be maintained without destroying the business life of the nations with which we dealt, because we were a debtor Nation. If they did not have the gold to pay us for our commodities, when they could not barter or exchange, they held vast amounts of American securities, and could pay us for our goods in the return of American securities, or with the interest on the debts that we owed in Europe, and the dividends.

But to-day no such condition confronts us. We are the one great creditor Nation of the world. The surplus gold of the world is locked in our vaults. American securities which are owned abroad have long since come home. There is no way by which the purchasers of American goods can pay the American people for the price of trade except through barter and exchange. If we have reached the period in the history of the country where the dominant party in control of this Nation for the next four years is about to launch a policy of government that stands for exclusion of foreign trade, the country should know it. If we are about to enter upon a policy that is to close the doors to importations from abroad, and give no chance to exchange our commodities for our neighbor's commodities, and thereby exclude foreign trade, we destroy the export business of the United States.

But not only that, the people of the world owe this Government and the people of America in the neighborhood of \$20,000,000,000, Government debts and private debts, and when you continue this policy and say, now that they have no gold to pay you with, and have no American securities to pay you with, that you propose to erect an embargo at the customhouse so that they can not pay your debts by selling you the products of their land and their factories and their mills, then you force repudiation upon them, and must let the burden of that indebtedness go back on your own people, and they become the sufferers in the end.

I take it that the party in power in this Chamber, the Republican Party, would not have proposed this measure if they had not determined on a policy for the future. I know and you know that you can not propose this measure now and repudiate it a few months from now. If this measure is adopted and becomes a law, the man who does not believe it means disaster and ruin to the country is a man without vision and without foresight, in my judgment.

Mr. President, I have said what I wished to say in opposition to this conference report. An extended argument on my part would accomplish nothing. I know that the vote is already prepared for delivery. But it will not end here, and when the hour comes when the American people realize the folly of this legislation there will be a day of reckoning yet to come.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have listened with my usual pleasure to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. I listened but a moment before with renewed pleasure to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], between whom and me of recent months there has been very little concordance of opinion. But I think that a moment ago he made one of the most brilliant and one of the most profound analyses of the falsity of the whole protective system that I have ever listened to in this Chamber.

I never had an intellect which permitted my momentary un-friendship for a man to interfere with my appreciation of his intellectual ability. I especially listened to his analysis of the *bête noire* of all the economists for a long time and the "scarecrow" that the Republican Party has held out as a fright to the view of the people in the shape of an image of "pauper labor."

I just want to say that I wish the Senator from Missouri had gone one step farther while he was disclosing the fact that pauper labor was powerless, and had shown the real cause of its powerlessness, because there are two weapons which it does not possess nor ever can possess. One weapon is machinery and the other is intelligence. It needs intelligence even to operate the clumsiest machinery.

The fact is that pauper labor is always helpless, no matter how cheap its per diem purchase, as compared with intelligent labor, whose value is measured in its per product purchase, because pauper labor has not the machinery and has not the intelligence.

Then, I would wish that he had gone one step farther and had said two other things which are always true. Those two other things are these: *Machinery is capitalized intellect and intelligence is capitalized labor*. The two together spell accumulation, and accumulation of invention and intelligence spells civilization. I just wanted to add those words to the debate, and shall rest content with the final judgment of the people.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I hope we can now have the vote on the emergency tariff bill.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. SIMMONS called for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HENDERSON. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK], who would vote on this question as I shall vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. I am informed that he is in favor of this bill, so I am free to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McCUMBER (when Mr. PENROSE's name was called). The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] is necessarily absent from the Senate, having been called away. If he were present and not paired he would vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], who has not been able to be present, and I have not been able to secure a transfer of my pair. If that Senator were present and I were entitled to vote, I should take infinite pleasure in voting "nay"; but as it is, I must withhold my vote. The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GLASS. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have secured a transfer of my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH]. I vote "nay."

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—49.

Ashurst	Dillingham	Jones, N. Mex.	McCumber
Ball	Elkins	Jones, Wash.	McLean
Borah	Fernald	Kellogg	McNary
Brandegge	Frelinghuysen	Kendrick	Myers
Calder	Gay	Kenyon	Nelson
Capper	Gooding	Knox	New
Chamberlain	Gronna	La Follette	Norris
Cummins	Hale	Lenroot	Phelan
Curtis	Henderson	Lodge	Phipps

Pittman
Polindexter
Ransdell
Sheppard

Smoot
Spencer
Sterling
Sutherland

Townsend
Wadsworth
Warren
Watson

Willis

NAYS—36.

Beckham
Colt
Culberson
Dial
Edge
Fletcher
Gerry
Glass
Gore

Harris
Harrison
Heflin
Hitchcock
Keyes
King
Kirby
McKellar
Moses

Overman
Owen
Pomerene
Reed
Shields
Simmons
Smith, Ga.
Smith, Md.
Smith, S. C.

Stanley
Swanson
Thomas
Trammell
Underwood
Walsh, Mass.
Walsh, Mont.
Williams
Wolcott

NOT VOTING—11.

Fall
France
Johnson, Calif.

Johnson, S. Dak.
McCormick
Newberry

Page
Penrose
Robinson

Sherman
Smith, Ariz.

So the conference report was agreed to.

BONUS FOR EX-SOLDIERS.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I am instructed by the Committee on Finance to report back favorably with certain amendments the bill (H. R. 14157) to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, to provide revenues therefor, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 821) thereon.

I am instructed also to state that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] will file a minority report.

I have been requested also in making the report to present a short statement of the action of the committee thereon. I hope that Senators will allow me this opportunity without interruption so that I may present the matter clearly in 5 or 10 minutes to the end that we may all understand it without going through the more voluminous report.

The bill, known as the soldiers' bonus bill, passed the House in the very closing days of the last session. It contained five different schemes of remuneration, all except the cash plan, in their details, being complex and exceedingly difficult of cost estimate.

As it was apparent even at that time that the Treasury could not meet the added obligation created by the proposed law under our present revenue system, these several bonus proposals were accompanied by a tax scheme which gave little heed to what the business on which it was levied could stand.

Of course, it was not expected and it was not possible that the bill should be considered by the Congress until the assembling of the short winter session; and it is apparent to anyone acquainted with the work of Congress that during the short session, with all the supply bills and other legislation necessary for the conduct of the Government, no such revision of our tax laws as contemplated could be accomplished.

It has been asserted on the floor and elsewhere that the Finance Committee has had this bill since the last of May, 1920. Of course, Senators and Members of Congress know this is not true. They know that Congress adjourned June 5 and did not meet until the month of December. So the committee has had the bill only during part of December, all of January, and part of February.

Hearings were given by the committee early in the session. At the same time hearings were given on the emergency tariff bill. It is needless to say that there are members of the committee who are intensely opposed to this legislation at this time, and that the Secretary of the Treasury considers it most unwise to either add to the taxes or to issue bonds for this purpose.

The exact time at which the bill shall become a law is not so important, provided it is passed a sufficient time prior to the beginning of payments thereunder to enable the veterans to make their selection. The bill, both as it passed the House and as recommended by the Committee on Finance of the Senate, fixes a time in the future for the beginning of the payments thereunder. Therefore, the question whether it becomes a law at the close of this session or early in the next session is not at all important.

The one important thing to the veteran is that its enactment is certain. The important thing to the country is that the payments to be made under it shall begin at such a period as will enable the country to tide over present deficits, and that its obligation, whatever it may be, shall be established to the end that the revenue bill to be taken up in April may be framed with that obligation in view. I hope we can pass it this session. But I appreciate that with the supply bills knocking loudly at our doors, any Senator or number of Senators, however small, could delay final action until the April session.

The committee decided a few days ago to report the bill favorably with such amendments as would postpone the beginning of the payments under it until a period 18 months later than that fixed by the House bill, and would leave the method

of meeting the obligation to be determined by the Congress at the April session. I was instructed to present to the committee as accurate a statement as possible as to what this legislation would cost the country, and how that cost would be distributed throughout the ensuing years.

I immediately began my work and have continued it every day, including Sunday, and with the aid of the Actuary from the Treasury Department have just completed the necessary tables to present the matter intelligently to the Congress and to the country.

The Treasury reports show that for the fiscal years 1921 and 1922 there will be an aggregate deficit of nearly \$3,500,000,000. If this bill is to go into effect July 1, 1921, as it passed the House, we must issue bonds to meet its requirements. The Secretary of the Treasury deems it most unwise to force a loan at this time, under the depressed conditions of the country and with a sure falling off of revenues. I think we may assume that the Secretary of the Treasury is in accord with the Executive, and therefore the enactment of the bill without such extension of the time of payments thereunder as will pass its obligations over these deficit years might meet with Executive disapproval. The committee, considering all these matters, fixed January 1, 1923, as the date for the beginning of payments thereunder. I think the bill should be passed in that form, leaving the conference committee of the two Houses to get together on some exact date which would not be earlier than July 1, 1921, nor later than January 1, 1923. Or, if the Senate believe that a date earlier than January 1, 1923, should be fixed, it can voice its judgment by an appropriate amendment. I believe that greater progress and better results could be obtained by passing the bill as presented by the Senate committee.

In order to arrive at anything definite we must determine as nearly as may be the number who will avail themselves of each provision of the bill. And, as we may differ in the matter of our estimates of this number, it will necessitate several tables, taking several different estimates as their basis. And with all of them before us, showing the absolute minimum and the possible maximum, we can arrive at a conclusion that will be approximately correct as to the cost and how much must be appropriated each year to cover it.

In making these computations it was necessary to ascertain the number having overseas service, the number having home service, the man days at home and the man days abroad, the average days' service at home, and the average days' service abroad. The 60 days must first be deducted from the home service, and if less than 60 days of such service, then the balance must be deducted from the overseas service. We must estimate for the number who will in all probability apply for each plan, and we must submit several tables based upon different estimates of these proportionate numbers. In each case we must make use of mortality tables to determine the number of deaths, and must make allowance therefor.

In the certificate plan we must, in addition, estimate the number of borrowers and the percentage of borrowings. We must again make allowance for deaths each year, and the amounts that will become immediately due by reason of such deaths. We must make allowances in each table for yearly repayments of borrowings.

A brief statement of the general plan of the bill, the merits of the bill, the precedents for like legislation, what other countries are doing for their soldiers, the reasons guiding us in making our estimates for the proportionate number applying under each plan, and the tables presenting these estimates are all set forth in full in the report.

Table I shows the cost to the country if every veteran should accept the cash plan, together with the amount to be paid each year. This cash plan involves the minimum expenditure.

Table II shows the total cost if every veteran should accept the certificate plan, with no borrowings, together with the estimated amount to be paid each year due to deaths.

The only purpose of this table, No. II, is to show the greatest possible cost to the country. The two together present the two extremes. The cash plan would require nearly all of the entire debt to be paid in the first two years, a small balance running into the third year. The certificate plan, though involving a much larger sum, would distribute the payments over 20 years.

Table III shows the total cost if 80 per cent of the veterans should accept the certificate plan and 20 per cent the cash plan, together with the cost each year, making allowance for an estimate of 33½ per cent of borrowings and payment of full amounts assured on account of deaths. It is my opinion that this table will be the most accurate one presented.

Under the 20-year endowment plan employed by the principal insurance companies, about 15 per cent of the total insurance is

represented in borrowings. We have a little more than doubled that amount in our estimate.

Table IV shows the cost if 66½ per cent should apply for the certificate plan and 33½ per cent for the cash plan, making allowance for deaths and estimating the borrowings at 33½ per cent.

The experience tables of the large insurance companies carrying 20-year endowment insurance policies show about 15 per cent of the total insurance loaned out to the policyholders. To be conservative, we have more than doubled this amount.

Table V shows the total cost if 50 per cent should apply for the certificate plan and 50 per cent for the cash plan, making the same allowance for deaths and borrowings.

All three of these last-mentioned tables must, of course, allow for the installment repayments.

Following the concluding pages of the report we have—

Total number in service in Army	4,262,105
Total man days' service from Apr. 5, 1917, to July 1, 1919	1,427,325,000
Average days' service per man	334.89
Total number overseas force in Army	2,022,635
Total man days' service overseas from Apr. 5, 1917, to July 1, 1919	709,740,000
Average days' service per man overseas	350.90
Total number exclusively in home service force	2,239,470
Total man days' home service from Apr. 5, 1917, to July 1, 1919	717,585,000
Average days' service per man home service, less 60 days to be deducted first from home service	260.42
Number of deaths in service overseas	80,635
Number of deaths home service	34,617
Total deaths in service	115,252
Number of officers above rank of captain in overseas force (estimated)	7,000
Number of officers above rank of captain in home service (estimated)	7,500
Total number of officers above rank of captain	14,500
Number of deaths in Army from July 1, 1919, to Jan. 1, 1923 (estimated)	117,586
Number in Army entitled to benefits Jan. 1, 1923	4,014,767
Total number in service in Navy	551,736
Deaths in service	2,341
Officers above rank of Lieutenant (estimated)	1,895
Number entitled to benefits of this bill July 1, 1919	4,236
Deaths between July 1, 1919, and Jan. 1, 1923	547,500
Number entitled to benefits Jan. 1, 1923	15,579
Overseas force (estimated)	531,921
Home force (estimated)	500,000
Average length of service	47,500
Less 60 days deducted	325
Total number Army and Navy entitled to benefits Jan. 1, 1923	265
	4,546,688

The cost tables show as follows:

1. On the basis that every veteran should accept the cash plan—

Total cost	\$1,547,904,305
To be appropriated for in 1923	909,337,600
To be appropriated for in 1924	600,014,102
To be appropriated for in 1925	38,552,693

2. On the basis that every veteran should accept the certificate plan, with no borrowings, and making allowance for annual payments on account of deaths—

Total amount in 1943 would aggregate	\$5,251,364,907
To be appropriated for in 1923	44,256,180

This sum increases yearly up to 1942, when—

The amount required would be	56,962,190
Leaving all the balance to be paid in a single payment due in 1943 of	4,290,280,031

But as suggested, these two tables do not indicate what, in fact, will be the operation of the law, but are given to show possible minimum and maximum costs and place a limit upon extreme calculations.

3. On the basis that 20 per cent of the veterans should accept the cash-payment plan and 80 per cent the certificate plan, and assuming that one-third of those entitled borrow on their certificates the full amount they are entitled to borrow, and making allowance for repayments, and also for deaths, the total amount in 1943 would aggregate \$4,356,338,615.

The yearly payments, however, would be—

1923	\$217,302,544
1924	155,456,774
1925	94,108,665
1926	70,228,416
1927	59,441,691

After 1927 the annual payments would decrease on account of repayment of borrowings until 1936, when the repayments on account of loans would be more than sufficient to meet the payments on account of deaths and loans. This would continue until 1940, when the excess of payments on account of deaths would amount to \$2,543,321. These payments would increase until in 1942 they would amount to \$19,325,219. The final payment on account of maturity in 1943 would amount to \$3,383,692,496.

4. On the basis that one-third of the veterans should accept the cash-payment plan and two-thirds the certificate plan, making the same allowance as in previous tables, the entire cost up to and including 1943 would be \$3,888,282,142.

The yearly payments would be as follows:

1923	\$332,641,720
1924	229,566,161
1925	84,348,649

From 1925 the amounts would decrease until 1935, when there would be no cost until 1939, four years, during which period the repayments would exceed the amounts necessary to meet the obligation. There would be a balance due at the maturity of the certificates in 1943 of \$2,819,743,747.

5. On the basis that 50 per cent of the veterans take the cash-payment plan and 50 per cent the certificate plan, making the same allowance as in the previous tables, the entire cost up to and including 1943 would be \$3,303,153,231.

The yearly payments would be as follows:

1923	\$476,796,890
1924	322,165,772
1925	72,146,424

These yearly amounts then decrease each year to 1936. Then there would be an excess of repayments of loans over payments on account of loans and deaths for the four years, 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939, of over \$20,000,000. A final payment upon the matured certificates would be due in 1943 of \$2,114,807,810.

It will thus be seen that while this bill provides for a very large sum, when distributed over the 20 years, under any reasonable estimate of the proportionate number that will apply for each plan, the yearly cost will not be burdensome. And if, as suggested in the report, the debts due this country from our war associates should be funded into long-time, interest-bearing bonds the interest thereon will far more than take care of the obligations created by the bill without any increase whatever in our taxes.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I understand the motion is debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to submit some observations.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment to enable me to submit a proposed amendment to the pending bill?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to House bill 15975, the naval appropriation bill, which I ask may be printed, lie on the table, and be incorporated in the Record.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed, to lie on the table, and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Provided, That the President is hereby authorized in his discretion to delay in whole or in part the building program herein provided for, for a period of six months, in order to enable him to arrange for a conference with the Governments of Great Britain, Japan, and such other powers as to him may seem proper, with the view of reducing substantially the naval building program of the several Governments so participating in said conference; and if they agree upon such plan of reduction the President is hereby further authorized to suspend, in whole or in part, the said building program in order to enable him to carry out any agreement thus made.

Mr. THOMAS. On behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick] I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 15975, the naval appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to lie on the table and be printed, as follows:

On page 6, after line 3, insert the following:
"Historical pictorial record of the American fleet in foreign waters: To enable the Secretary of the Navy, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to authorize and employ Burnell Poole to continue his work on an historical pictorial record of the operation of the American fleet in foreign waters, \$25,000."

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to bring before the Senate the joint resolution repealing war time legislation.

Mr. BORAH. What was the request?

Mr. STERLING. The request is that I may bring before the Senate the joint resolution declaring that certain war time acts of Congress—joint resolutions and proclamations—shall be construed as if the war had terminated.

Mr. BORAH. At the present time there is a motion before the Senate. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Wash-

ington, I desire to say that there are some remarks upon the naval bill that I should like to make before the motion is finally put. I understand, of course, that the Senator will ultimately get his bill before the Senate, but I do desire to say something in regard to it before the motion to take it up is voted upon. If, however, the Senator from Washington will delay his request so that the Senator from South Dakota may prefer his, of course I have no objection. I simply do not want to lose my opportunity to say what seems to me to be relevant before the bill is taken up.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Rule IX is not perfectly clear to me. I notice that preference is given to a motion to proceed to the consideration of an appropriation bill, and certain other motions are in order, and the rule provides that—

Each of the foregoing motions shall be decided without debate and shall have precedence in the order above named.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is after the consideration of bills not objected to, and not later than 2 o'clock. This is after 2 o'clock, and the motion is debatable.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The rule is not particularly clear, and that is why I asked the Chair.

I will say to the Senator from Idaho, so far as I am concerned and in accordance with conversations I have had with the Senator from South Dakota, that when the naval bill is taken up for consideration I shall give consent, so far as I am concerned, to proceeding for a brief time to the consideration of the matter of which the Senator from South Dakota has spoken; but I desire to get the naval bill up first.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, what I said to the Senator from Washington was that there are some observations upon this measure which I feel, in justice to the committee and myself, too, that I should make before the motion to take it up is voted upon, and I do not want to lose the opportunity to do so. If the Senator from Washington will permit the Senator from South Dakota to proceed without my losing my right to speak before the motion is voted upon, I have no objection to the agreement which they have made being carried out. In fact, I am anxious to have the agreement carried out.

Mr. STERLING. I so understood; and, furthermore, I do not think it will take a long time to dispose of the joint resolution.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. A proposal to take up an appropriation bill after 2 o'clock is debatable; is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If that be the case, and the Chair so rules, the Senator can get his opportunity to discuss it before the bill is taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is the exact parliamentary situation: The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] has moved to proceed to the consideration of the naval appropriation bill. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has the floor for the purpose of discussing the question as to whether it shall or shall not be taken up, or saying anything else he wants to say. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] interrupts by asking to take up another measure. He can take it up only by unanimous consent. He can not displace the motion of the Senator from Washington, but he can take it up by unanimous consent.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I object to the displacement of the motion which I made. I will state, however, that in conversation with the Senator from South Dakota I told him that, so far as I was concerned, I should allow him to take up his matter for a brief time after the naval bill is laid before the Senate.

Mr. STERLING. I will state that it is not my desire at all to displace the naval appropriation bill; and I will ask unanimous consent, if permitted, if the Senator from Idaho will yield for that purpose, to take up this joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has already objected to that.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I understood that the request of the Senator from South Dakota for unanimous consent was before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington said he would object; that he wanted a vote on the question as to whether or not the naval bill should be taken up; so that disposes of the request for the present.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to inquire of the Senator if he would be willing for me to offer at this time some amendments that I have prepared to the soldiers' bonus bill and make a short explanation of those amendments? I should like to have my amendments and the statement I desire to make in regard to them get in the RECORD along with the statement made awhile ago by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER].

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I should be pleased to accommodate the Senator from New Mexico if it were not for the fact that I might lose an opportunity, in view of the rapidity with which things move in these days, to make the observations which I desire to make. Of course, on the question of time, nothing would be gained one way or the other whether I speak now or after the bill is up; but there are some suggestions which I desire to make which I think ought to be made before the bill comes up, and it is not a question of time; it is a question of the propriety of the occasion when they should be made. I do not want to yield to the Senator from New Mexico unless it is satisfactory to the Senator from Washington, for I rather suspect that the Senator from Washington is under the impression that I am trying to kill time, which I am not.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am very glad to be reassured by the Senator from Idaho. I shall be compelled to object to the interruption of the remarks of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I understand that it is out of order, and that the Senator from Washington has a right to object, but I want to state to the Senator from Washington now that I am going to oppose the taking up of the naval bill until the bonus bill is disposed of.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I was not entirely oblivious to the remark which the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] made, that he was glad to be reassured that I was not here for the purpose of occupying time. There are a great many dilatory motions which might have been made in regard to this bill which have not been made, and so far as I am concerned there will not be any dilatory motions made. I simply desire to discuss the bill upon what I believe to be its merits, and I do not desire to be hurried, although it is in the closing hours of the session, but I promise the Senator in good faith that I shall not talk against time.

Mr. President, there is a great deal of discussion just now, in the press and elsewhere, about having an adequate Navy. I am myself for an adequate Navy, if I understand what the term means. One of the first important votes which I cast in this body after I came here was a vote in approval of what was known as President Roosevelt's naval building program. I think it was for four or five battleships, and I voted in favor of that program. I also voted for the great naval program of 1916, and supported it, and I am still unconscious of any modification of views in regard to this subject. I certainly desire a sufficient, adequate Navy; and it is not my purpose, now or at any other time, to change my position in regard to that important matter. Of course, in saying that the adequacy of a Navy must be measured by the conditions and circumstances of the particular occasion when it is being built, and also the circumstances and conditions under which it is being built. If we should be so successful as to secure an agreement among the great naval powers of the world, that which would constitute an adequate Navy under such an agreement would be one thing, while if we should fail to secure any such agreement, of course, what would constitute an adequate Navy would be an entirely different thing. I have no desire, however, to throw any vote of mine or any limited influence which I may have in favor of a weak Navy or an insufficient Navy or an inadequate Navy. I have in no sense modified my views as to the necessity of an adequate Navy.

So much for a matter which is not really relevant to the point which I rose to discuss. If I understand the parliamentary situation with reference to the naval bill, to take it up at this time is really to waste time. This bill at the present time carries something over \$500,000,000 of appropriations. If it were a question of appropriations alone, a mere question of getting the money out of the Treasury, it would be a comparatively simple matter, and it would not necessarily involve any considerable discussion.

We might be opposed to the amount appropriated or we might be in favor of it, but there would be only one question involved. But this naval bill involves not only the question of a stupendous appropriation of five hundred and odd million dollars, but it involves a number of other matters—the size of the Navy, the

kind of a Navy, the building program, and certain other propositions which have been attached, as for establishing a naval base upon the Pacific coast, a matter which is bound to lead to long discussion. If we were considering this bill other than in the closing days of the session, we would not expect to close the discussion of it under three or four days' time, and the time could very well be occupied, and very legitimately occupied, to the illumination not only of the Senate, I have no doubt, but of the country, if that discussion should go on. So, if we should consider this bill with any degree of care at all, it would be practically impossible to get it into conference before 48 hours prior to the time when adjournment would take place.

The House appropriated \$400,000,000, in round figures, for a navy. No such sum for a navy was ever before contemplated in time of peace in the history of the world. The House appropriation alone, with nothing added to it, exceeds any appropriation or any provision of any program that any country ever made in time of peace in the history of the world for its navy. But, notwithstanding the fact that so large a sum was appropriated in the House, the Senate committee has seen fit, in its wisdom or unwisdom, to add one hundred and odd million more.

So we have the judgment of the House as to the sufficiency of the appropriation of four hundred millions, then we have the other sum of a hundred million added by the Senate committee, all of which involves, as you will see as we proceed, not only the question of the appropriation but it involves the other question of the kind of program we shall have with reference to construction.

The House bill met with a great deal of opposition in the House, and, if I may be permitted to say so—and I do not think I am trespassing upon the rules—it passed the House after the assurance of the leader of the majority that not one dollar would be accepted in the way of increase when it came back to the House, and that is a part of the record of the debate. In order to allay the very strong and persistent opposition, it was practically a part of the program in the House that there should be no increase made by this body that they would accept.

We have, therefore, this parliamentary situation, that \$100,000,000 has been added, with three days, at the outside, to consider this bill in this body, in conference, and in the House, with the program understood to be in the House that no additions should be made to the bill. I repeat, therefore, that, judging the parliamentary situation as we see it and as it appears to be a matter of record, there is no possible chance to pass this bill at this session and to give it any consideration such as it deserves at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Can the Senator cite us to the day and the page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where that debate took place? Has he the RECORD before him?

Mr. BORAH. I have not it here, but it was on the 14th of this month, the debate beginning on page 3144 of the RECORD. The Senator will find it under the naval debate.

As I looked at the House bill, Mr. President, it seemed to me a very liberal bill, indeed, even from the standpoint of those who are in favor of a very large and strong Navy. It provided a personnel of 100,000, about twenty-odd thousand greater than that of Japan and within 5,000 of being equal to that of Great Britain.

There was considerable discussion over the point in the House, and they finally agreed upon that number, as I have said. The Senate has added to the personnel, making it 120,000, thereby adding an expenditure of something over \$37,000,000.

In addition to that, the House bill provided for the entire building program of 1916. It did not limit it or curtail it or suspend it or modify it in any sense whatever. So the House bill would be considered, under all ordinary circumstances, as a very reasonable bill, even by those who are in favor of a large Navy. To my mind, while I am in favor of a strong Navy, it seems to me an extravagant bill.

If we will recur to the expenditures which have been made at other times, we will find by comparison how very liberal the House was in regard to this matter. Let us take the appropriations for the Navy from 1910 to 1912. In 1910 we appropriated \$133,216,693 for the Navy. That was at the time of the beginning of the building program, under President Taft's administration, at a time characterized as very extraordinary and very extravagant. In 1911 we appropriated \$127,818,681. In 1912 we appropriated \$120,739,055. In 1913 we appropriated \$142,550,000.

The House, in other words, in a time of peace, as against the prior appropriations, appropriated close to two and a half or

three times the amount which we were appropriating prior to the war, and the House bill would seem to be a very liberal bill.

Take another comparison, Mr. President. The building program of Great Britain in 1912, at a time when Germany and Great Britain were really in competition in naval building, was only \$80,662,790, and Germany, which, we are advised continuously, was in 1912 preparing for the Great War, in anticipation of the conflict appropriated for new construction that year \$59,455,935; France appropriated \$35,574,380; Russia appropriated \$34,487,900.

The total appropriations for the naval construction of these four great powers in 1912 were \$210,181,005, and we can grasp something of the liberality of the bill which passed the House when we contemplate that it provides for more than a hundred million dollars in excess of the entire building program of those four great powers in 1912.

In 1913 Great Britain appropriated \$93,380,400; Germany, \$55,054,415; Russia, \$60,412,580; and France, \$44,465,320.

The total combined appropriations for the building programs of those four powers in 1913 were only \$253,312,715.

Can it be said, Mr. President, that in a time of peace a bill which provides for \$400,000,000 is not sufficiently liberal to satisfy the demands for an adequate Navy, when we contemplate that upon the eve of the Great War, when it is said that some of them were knowingly and all of them unconsciously preparing for the great conflict, those nations appropriated a little over that amount combined?

I touch upon another subject here, although very briefly, because I propose to refer to it later, that these great building programs did not prevent war. At the time the Great War began the combined navy of the Entente was very much greater than the combined navy of the Triple Alliance. They had been building against one another from 1900 on, adding year by year, and I simply pause here to say to those who now seem to anticipate some trouble in some direction, and that by this stupendous program we will overawe some power, that it did not so operate in the great contest between Germany and Great Britain. However, that is aside from the question which I now desire to present.

The total naval expenditure of Great Britain for all purposes in 1912 was \$228,082,700. The total naval expenditures of Germany were only \$113,047,700 in 1913.

The entire outlay by Great Britain in that year was a little over half of what the House has already provided for in this bill, and the entire outlay for naval appropriations in 1913 for Germany were \$113,000,000, a little over a third of what the House has provided for in this bill.

It is one thing, Mr. President, to be for an adequate Navy and for reasonable preparation for unexpected or expected difficulties; but does the Senate want to enter upon the consideration of this bill under the whip and lash to get through when we have \$400,000,000 appropriated by the House and a hundred and six odd millions added by the Senate of the United States? With all due respect to those who framed the bill, it seems to me that they ought to permit the bill to go over, so that it can be considered under circumstances and conditions which will enable us to deal with it as should be done.

Now, the personnel of Great Britain in 1912 was 134,000 men. It is at this time 105,000. The personnel of the German Navy in 1912 was 60,805; of France, 58,649 men; of Russia, 46,655 men; and of Austria-Hungary, 17,277 men. The Triple Entente all combined had a personnel of 238,294 men and the Triple Alliance 108,669 men.

The House bill gives us a Navy, if it is completed, it has been estimated, 31 per cent stronger and greater than that of the navy of Great Britain. Is it not sufficient? Have we become intoxicated? Has the psychology of war not departed at all?

The program of the House bill, if it is completed, will give us a Navy two and one-fourth times greater than that of Japan. What possible reason can there be for our adding \$100,000,000?

Of course, if the bill comes before the Senate at this time, under these circumstances, anyone who has any convictions upon the subject must necessarily insist upon adjusting the bill to what he believes to be a reasonable appropriation.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PHIPPS in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. I dislike to interrupt the Senator, but what did I understand the Senator to say the House bill would furnish in proportion to the British Navy?

Mr. BORAH. A Navy 31 per cent stronger than the British Navy and two and one-fourth times stronger than that of

Japan. If there is any doubt about that, I shall be glad to have some one say so.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask in what manner the figures show it is 31 per cent greater? Is it in personnel or in armament, or how?

Mr. BORAH. I will tell the Senator how I figure. I figure upon the expert testimony of members of the Navy, both in this country and abroad. I do not as a layman undertake to say, of course, what it would be, but that has been stated by men who have served their lifetime in the Navy, and I do not believe it can be successfully disputed. What strength does the Senator from Delaware think we will have compared to their navy?

Mr. BALL. We will still be very much inferior to Great Britain's Navy when we complete the present program, according to all the testimony given before the committee.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, no; not according to all the testimony, as I shall read it as the debate proceeds.

Mr. BALL. Before the Senate committee?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; before the Senate committee, for reasons which I shall discuss later, but not before the House committee, and not all before the Senate committee, either. That may be a matter which we shall wish to debate a little later. I do not desire at this time to take up time in the discussion of it, but I think I shall be able to show that that is the conclusion of men who, I believe, know.

Mr. BALL. I merely desired thoroughly to understand the statement of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. That was the statement.

Mr. BALL. It is so at variance with all the testimony that we had before the committee that I thought possibly the Senator was misstating his own proposition.

Mr. BORAH. No. I beg leave to say to the Senator that I have read the testimony, and I do not think my statement is at variance with the testimony. I am quite aware that it is at variance with the testimony of Admiral Coontz and some gentlemen who take a different view of it, but it is not at variance with the testimony of men who have earned the right to state their view in regard to it and by reason of their service and experience are entitled to consideration when that view is expressed. It may be a matter of debate which is correct.

Mr. BALL. It is scarcely a matter of debate. It is a matter of fact. So far as the personnel of the two countries is concerned, it can be ascertained. So far as the armament of the two countries is concerned, that can be ascertained. It is a matter of fact; it is not a matter of debate.

Mr. BORAH. If it is a matter of fact, there will be some testimony somewhere to establish the fact, and that is what I refer to.

I think it worth while to inquire at this time what is the state of the Treasury. What is the condition that confronts us with reference to these appropriations?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Before the Senator goes into that branch of the matter, can he give to the Senate a statement of the relative appropriations which are being made by Great Britain and Japan and the United States?

Mr. BORAH. I did not clearly understand the Senator's question.

Mr. POMERENE. What appropriations are being made or contemplated by Great Britain and Japan for navy purposes?

Mr. BORAH. I have been unable to get the exact appropriations for this year. I have seen statements in the public press in regard to it, but I do not know, as I did not undertake to get figures, whether they are correct or not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho whether it is not a fact that the large building program upon which Japan has now entered was the direct result of our very large building program announced a few years ago? Are we not directly responsible for the great building program upon which Japan has entered in her effort to maintain her position on the Pacific?

Mr. BORAH. That statement has been made by Japanese statesmen. Of course, I do not know what the facts are, but they have made that contention.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KING. If I may trespass upon the time of the Senator, I should like to reply to the Senator from Nebraska. I think there is a great deal of misapprehension as to the size of the naval program upon which it is alleged Japan has entered. As a matter of fact, Japan appropriated last year for her entire naval program approximately 230,000,000 yen. That would be approximately \$115,000,000. The national legislature was un-

able to agree as to her naval appropriation for the following year. Under the rule which prevails in Japan, as I am advised, if there is no agreement in the Diet with respect to appropriations for the following year, then the amount of the appropriation for the preceding year governs—that is to say, the same appropriation is carried—so that for the current year the appropriation of Japan for her entire naval budget is about \$115,000,000.

There is a great deal of talk by jingoists in the United States, who desire to force a war between the United States and Japan, or between the United States and England, in regard to the enormous appropriations for war which Japan is making. There is a great deal of nonsense concerning this subject.

Mr. BORAH. I have not the figures as to how much Japan is appropriating this year. I have seen statements of what she was to have as compared with our Navy, but I do not state it, because I do not know how much Japan is appropriating for this year. I am only stating figures thus far which are official and matters of record.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I was not seeking to develop what Japan was appropriating this year, but I think the Senator is aware that it is pretty well understood that Japan has entered upon a large building program to be carried out during the next few years. What I desired to ask him was whether we ourselves are not responsible for that effort of Japan, and whether we are not by our enormous building program stimulating the Japanese in their great building program in the Pacific?

Mr. BORAH. Count Ishii stated at Geneva, after France had objected to the disarmament program, that Japan was building by reason of the United States building, and that Japan would be very glad to enter into an understanding or agreement with the United States by which the building program should be reduced, changed, or modified. It was by reason of that interview of Count Ishii that I was led immediately to introduce a resolution in this body providing for Japan, Great Britain, and the United States sitting down together to enter upon such an agreement. If those who favor the resolution are successful, it need not be very long until we have Japan, the United States, and Great Britain in close conference to determine the sincerity of each of those powers with reference to the oft-insinuated proposition that one is building because the other is building.

I know of no way by which to test the sincerity of the three great powers except to bring them directly into contact with each other in conference. If it be true that Japan is building because the United States is building such a large Navy, that matter can soon be determined, because I think the people of the United States—I do not know whether all individuals in it, but the people of the United States as a whole—would insist upon the United States curtailing her program provided Japan would be willing to do so.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. The present program was instituted by the naval act of 1916, and one of the arguments in support of the bill was that Japan was then engaged in the construction of a very formidable navy. On the 27th of June of that year I addressed the Senate in opposition to the bill and made the assertion that if the program were adopted it would inevitably lead to increased building, and necessarily so, by such nations as Japan and Great Britain, both of which would attribute our sudden activity and the enormous plan for a Navy which was then outlined to some aggressive policy, either then secretly existing or thereafter to be developed, against which they should prepare.

That program was also stimulated by a phantom expedition from Japan to lower California, and the press, to say nothing of some of the addresses upon the floor of the Senate, called attention to that sinister action, which afterwards turned out to be the arrival of, I think, two boats engaged in a duty and ordered to extricate some small boat from quicksands or from a condition which it had gotten into and which needed this additional help in order that it might get back to Japan.

I have no doubt that within the next two or three months some other expedition equally substantial and equally formidable will be heralded over the country as the reason why this enormous expenditure of money at this time should continue.

Mr. BORAH. In reply to the Senator from Nebraska, and also the Senator from Colorado, of course we can only judge the situation at this distance by the statements of the representative men of Japan and the reliance which we are willing to place upon those statements. The two Governments have never been brought together, and we shall never know the real situation, the real sincerity behind the professed willingness to curtail naval building until they are brought together.

Germany started her naval program in 1900; immediately England added to her program; the next year Germany added to hers, and Great Britain did likewise. They were never willing to bring themselves to the conference table. The result was that that went on just as the discussion is now going on between the United States and Japan. The public prints conveyed the impression to the effect that one nation was building by reason of the fact that the other was building and that both were willing to stop if one would stop, but they never did come in contact with one another. The result was that their building program finally ended in the deluge of 1914. That is precisely, in my judgment, where the controversy will end between the United States and Japan unless we can come into friendly conference and reach an agreement.

I believe that this trouble spoken of can be avoided. I am sure it is our solemn duty to try.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOSES in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. While it is true that the navies of the allied and associated powers did not prevent war, is it not equally true that those large navies did prevent a victory by our enemies?

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Idaho has not proposed that we disarm in case Japan does not disarm. But is it not equally true that if Germany and England, say in 1905, when Germany proposed her second naval program, had entered into an agreement to stop all naval building beyond a very moderate degree, at least, in all probability there would not have been any war at all?

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I am not opposing the resolution of the Senator from Idaho; I am heartily in favor of it; but there have been some statements here on the floor that would seem to cast a reflection upon the war preparations made by our own country and by our allies just prior to the breaking out of the war and during the war. I think those preparations were all necessary, as has been demonstrated by the history of the war.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it may be they were necessary from the viewpoint of the Senator, but I think they were wholly unnecessary from the standpoint of reason or of sound statesmanship.

Mr. PITTMAN. I agree with the Senator from Idaho; but we have made one great effort since the war to get on a basis of sound reasoning and to settle disputes by arbitration and adjudication by peaceful means; and so far that has been a failure. What success the efforts of the Senator from Idaho will have is as problematical as the former; in fact, there is every reason to believe that it will be a failure. Nevertheless, we should try it. I am with the Senator in his effort to accomplish it; but I do not believe in stopping preparations for self-defense while we are seeking to avoid an offensive means of settling disputes.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know that the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Idaho are in disagreement; but I do not like to have so distinguished a Senator advise the other nations of the world while we are urging this proposition that it is going to be a failure, because there is where the difficulty arose with reference to the proposed agreement between Germany and Great Britain. All the governmental agencies, all the governmental powers, and all the governmental influences were constantly advising to the effect that by reason of the treachery and deceit and deception of the other power they could never hope to arrive at any agreement.

Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to have what I consider a reasonable navy, an adequate navy, until we reach that agreement; but I disagree with the Senator entirely upon the proposition that there is no reasonable basis for a hope of any such agreement being made. I firmly believe that there is such reason and that we should proceed upon the theory that an agreement can be reached.

The situation is a little different now from what it was before the World War. The people now are very much more interested in the question. The masses in Japan are discussing the question practically as fully as are the masses in this country or in Great Britain. We have about reached the point where the people can no longer endure the burden which is being imposed upon them by their Governments in their preparation for war.

Now, just a word with reference to another matter which the Senator suggested. I hope he will not suggest it again, because it would lead to a long debate.

Mr. PITTMAN. Then I shall not do so.

Mr. BORAH. I refer to the proposition that there was an effort made to adjust matters by arbitration, and so forth. I suppose the Senator has reference to the League of Nations. The Senator from Nevada knows that the Senator from Idaho thinks that that league was a league for war; that it was built for war, and was intended for war, and could not accomplish anything but war.

Mr. PITTMAN. I shall not revert to that any more, because I do not desire a long debate under the circumstances. However, I desire to say that I hope the Senator from Idaho is right in regard to the feeling of the populace of Japan. We were informed with regard to the people of Germany that they had a pacifist feeling and were opposed to the militaristic party in Germany, but it did not turn out that way. I am not at all sure that it will turn out that way in the case of Japan. In my opinion, the greatest hope of success for the plan formulated by the Senator from Idaho is to call attention to the fact that, just as Germany could not outbuild Great Britain and that her attempt to outbuild Great Britain was an utter failure, so Japan can not outbuild this country, nor can any other country in the world outbuild it; that while we are anxious to adopt disarmament, we are going to be prepared and to have as strong as, if not a stronger, fighting force on the waters and on the land, if necessary, than any nation that may attack us. I think that would be the strongest argument for the pacifists.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BORAH. In just a moment I will yield to the Senator from Montana. I want to read a quotation of the actual words used by one of the great English leaders in 1905 or 1906, at a time when they were discussing the probability of Germany and England getting together. He says:

A fleet of British line of battleships are the best negotiators in Europe.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, Germany was the nation that was responsible for the failure of the naval holiday between those countries, and she has paid for her responsibility by almost practical annihilation.

Mr. BORAH. Well, as to the responsibility, I am going to discuss that a little later.

I now yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire to recur to the view expressed by the Senator from Idaho to the effect that if an agreement had been entered into by Germany and Great Britain limiting the naval building program of each the war would not have occurred. Of course, an agreement of that character, having no wider scope than that, would allow Germany to develop her great army without let or hindrance; and I apprehend that if the naval building program of these two countries were limited and Germany were permitted to expand her army without limit, not only would the war have occurred but in all probability it would have occurred earlier than it did.

While I am in entire accord with all of the views expressed by the Senator from Idaho as to the necessity, so far as the interests of the world are concerned, that the building program of these naval nations should be limited, wars will not be prevented until we also accomplish a reduction of the land forces. I think that the Senator upon reflection will agree that Germany might be quite willing to limit her naval building program if she were at the same time at liberty to expand at will her great army, because by that she would be able practically to accomplish her purpose without regard to her navy.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho did not make the suggestion he did in regard to that without reflection. The Senator from Montana will recall that from the time of Frederick the Great until the year 1900, when Germany was unifying the German States and building up the greatest military force in the world, England and Germany were upon the best of terms, cordial in every respect, assisting one another, and that there was never any estrangement of the slightest nature between Germany and England until Germany began to build her navy.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I will yield in a moment. After the naval building program commenced the two countries immediately began to look upon one another with disfavor; bitterness grew apace; the newspapers began the discussion of war in both countries, saying that if either nation was going to defend its commercial interest it must fight for it. So that by the time the other difficulties arose in 1914 the old friendship of Germany and England which had been able to control the situation was entirely dissipated and gone, and there was no one to negotiate peace or to hold the balance in favor of peace when the turmoil

came in 1914. Had these two nations been friendly, had bitterness and suspicion and jealousy not been engendered because of naval competition they could have in all probability reached a settlement in August, 1914.

I say again, upon reflection, that I have no doubt at all that when the future historian comes to analyze the facts and to uncover the real situation it will not be the assassination at Sarajevo, in Bosnia, to which will be attributed the Great War, but the naval competition between Germany and Great Britain which went on from 1900 to 1914.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I am perfectly satisfied that the historian will not overlook the powerful influence of the development of Germany's great army as a determining factor as well as the expansion of her navy; but the influences that bring about great historical events are many, complicated, and complex. Of course, from the time of Frederick the Great down to very modern times France was the enemy of both Great Britain and Germany, threatening to dominate the world through her great military power. She never had a formidable navy; it was through her army that she expected to dominate the world. That was the circumstance which made friends of Germany and Great Britain. Subsequently, however, Germany was the great power which threatened to dominate the world through her powerful army, not through her navy at all. So I do not agree with the Senator that we can dismiss from all consideration the likelihood of Germany dominating all Europe not through her navy but through her army as the great factor in the precipitation of the conflict of 1914.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. OWEN. The army of Germany has been practically dissipated; the Allies are agreed upon the plan of disarmament of their armies; it only remains that the competition of navies may endanger the future peace of the world. So, the Senator from Idaho, in my judgment, is entirely right in making an earnest and resolute effort to bring about an end of this rivalry of competitive naval armaments. I hope that he will succeed; I believe that he ought to succeed; and I think the Senate ought to help him in the effort.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I trust that nothing that I said will be considered as in opposition to the views expressed by the Senator from Oklahoma. I fully agree that the necessity of the case requires such an agreement, but I insist that it does not go far enough. With respect to that feature, however, I will have something more to say before we get through.

Mr. BORAH. I shall not pursue that digression longer, because it comes up more properly upon another phase of this matter, at which time, if we have time, we can discuss it more at length.

At the time that we digressed to take up the particular subject now being discussed, I had recurred to the condition of the United States Treasury, to the situation which confronts us at the time we are making these appropriations.

We all know that the distress throughout the business region of the country, and more particularly throughout the agricultural region of the country, is very serious. So far as the conditions throughout the Middle West and the West are concerned, they have practically reached the point of paralysis. There is really nothing doing. The banks have reached their limit. The farmers and the live-stock men can not pay their taxes, and they are not prepared to go into the work of raising another crop. They can not even get the means ordinarily given them at the beginning of each year from the banks to assist them; and one of the things which is most discouraging to them of all others, according to the communications which I have and the press which I read in that region of the country, is the fact that when they look toward the city of Washington they see nothing but additional appropriations and additional taxes. There is no encouragement that there will be relief at any time at the rate at which we are now going.

I could read a multitude of letters, but I want to read a single paragraph from a letter of one of the great bankers of the West, written to another business man, not to me, but I had permission to take a paragraph from his letter. He says:

The situation throughout our part of the United States is full of peril. A kind of paralysis is upon this part of the country. Nothing moves. The farmers and stockmen are discouraged and ugly. The banks have reached their limit. Some of them are in a dangerous condition, and when we look toward Congress in the hope of encouragement, at least, we see appropriations piling up as never before in the history of our country.

I realize there is not a great deal that Congress could do in the way of actual legislation to affirmatively assist us. Perhaps our situation is not such as to be reached by legislation; but it would seem, if Con-

gress knows the condition of the country, the distress of business, that it would restrain within reason our expenditures before we are literally buried in taxes.

I have an idea that that portrays a situation which is almost universal in the agricultural and live-stock regions of the United States, and we know, according to reports which are reliable, that there are some three and a quarter million men out of employment. Under those conditions, we are not only justified in looking to the question of appropriations, but we are justified, when we are called upon to make an appropriation, in taking into consideration the financial and economic condition of the country.

I would not advocate here leaving our defense inadequate or our Navy inadequate, even if it did increase a burden already seemingly unbearable; but when the House has already appropriated \$400,000,000 for the Navy, which gives us a personnel of 100,000 men and a Navy, when the program is completed, equal to if not greater than any other Navy in the world, can we not, out of deference to those who see no light ahead upon this question of our economic condition, defer adding \$106,000,000 to the bill in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Has the Senator given the Senate a chance to vote upon taking up his resolution with reference to this conference?

Mr. BORAH. No.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator has not made a direct motion that it be taken up?

Mr. BORAH. No; I have not. I have it pending.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I hope the Senator will make it. I shall certainly support it.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I shall.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And I am ready to take it up and dispose of it before we go on with any other measure.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, these remarks, as I say, were preliminary to voting on this motion. I realize, of course, that the Senator from Washington and the Naval Affairs Committee are likely to insist upon going ahead; but I have said this much in order that you may know that some of us feel very sincerely about this matter, and that we feel that there ought not to be any additions made to this bill without the most convincing reasons. Almost every important item in the bill has been increased, and we shall have to know the reasons for it, and those reasons ought to be, it seems to me, very controlling at this time.

I want to say just one word again before I sit down in regard to my position with regard to the Navy.

If we are wholly unable to reach an agreement with regard to the Navy and naval building, I am perfectly willing to go along with any reasonable program with reference to this matter; but there are two things which we ought to have in view which seems to me possible. The first is reaching an agreement, and the second is determining what is an adequate Navy and what is a modern Navy before we proceed to expend money as we are now doing. Let us strive in every possible way to come to an agreement to disarm. We can afford to lead in an effort to get this agreement. If it can not be secured, let us be sure that we are not wasting money in building an obsolete Navy and then wake up to the fact that we have to spend billions in order to get a modern Navy.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] I offer an amendment to the pending bill, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. H. Overhue, its assistant enrolling clerk, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House unanimously adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. DICK T. MORGAN, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma.

The message also communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House unanimously adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. CHARLES A. NICHOLS, late a Representative from the State of Michigan.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 13944. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain

widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 14063. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and to certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

BONUS FOR EX-SOLDIERS.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I feel that the Senate, for the few remaining days of this session of Congress, may well devote its efforts to something that will be of more material and immediate benefit to the country, or to certain interests of the country, than the naval appropriation bill.

It is known that we are to have a special session of Congress beginning early in the month of April. I remember very well the efforts that were made upon the floor of this body in 1919 to defer the so-called supply bills, and it was frequently stated upon the other side of the Chamber that no harm could come from such action, that we would have to have a special session of Congress, and in fact the postponement of the supply bills was used as a means for forcing the calling of a special session of Congress. No such purpose is necessary at this time. It is openly announced that we are to have a special session of Congress beginning the 1st of April. This bill for the Navy can only begin to operate after the 1st of next July.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOSES in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to remind the Senator that the defeat of the appropriation bills in 1919, eight or nine of them, resulted very beneficially to the country. Those bills were brought in here at a very late hour. The appropriations which they carried were very large. I, for one, was convinced that opportunity for reasonable discussion was not possible in the few hours of the life of that Congress then remaining, and I believed that if the bills were defeated at that time and could be considered in an extra session with time for deliberation the excessive appropriations would be very greatly reduced; and I remember definitely that as those bills were enacted at the extra session they carried an aggregate of almost \$1,000,000,000 less than the amount which they carried at the time they were proposed in the last hours of the final session of the Sixty-fifth Congress.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that the appropriation bills as finally enacted in that year were for a very much less sum than had previously been estimated, because when the estimates for those bills were prepared the armistice had not yet been signed, and it was not known that the war was to end so soon, and it could not have been known what amount of money would be required for the necessities of the Government. It is true that the previous estimates were modified, and as time went on, when the special session did come around, there was a very marked reduction in the amount of the appropriations as compared with the estimates, and even the final estimates that had been furnished by the various departments.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator will pardon me further—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not refer to the estimates, which were made, of course, months before the appropriation bills were reported. I was not instituting a comparison between the amount of the estimates and the appropriations that were made at the extra session, but between the amounts which the appropriation bills carried and which they would have carried had they been passed in the last days of February and the first days of March two years ago and the amounts which they carried when they were passed in May, three months following, when there was time for deliberation and a full discussion of the items of the bill.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator is unquestionably accurate as to the facts; but it must not be overlooked that those bills were prepared and presented to the Senate by the various committees on the basis of the official estimates which had been previously made.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Those estimates were made after the armistice.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That, however, does not concern the real point which I wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate. I merely wanted to observe and have the Senate realize that it is not absolutely essential to pass the naval appropriation bill at this session of Congress; that we are going to have a special session, and this appropriation bill will not go into

force or effect until the 1st of next July; and that if there is business of the Government which ought to be done which is of an emergency nature we ought to devote our time to those things rather than put in our time during these last few hours in passing an appropriation bill which will not go into effect for some months to come.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] this afternoon, in presenting the report of the Finance Committee on the so-called soldiers' bonus bill, rather intimated that it was not expected to pass that bill through the Senate at this session of Congress. He did not make that statement, but, to my great surprise, after he had presented the report of the committee he made no effort to bring the bill before the Congress for its consideration.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator would hardly expect me to do that before the report, which gives all the information, is printed. I assume it will be printed to-morrow. So far as the expectation of passing the bill is concerned, that is entirely with the Senate, of course. I think the Senator could not have heard me correctly, because I expressed the hope that we would pass the bill at the present session.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. At the time the Senator from North Dakota presented the report of the committee I announced that I reserved the right to file a minority report. I have not yet had time to prepare that report. I shall do it as soon as possible. I should certainly object to the consideration of the bill before that report is prepared.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I did not know the Senator from Colorado had not as yet prepared his minority report. I am glad to be advised that the Senator from North Dakota has not given up hope that the bill may be considered by the Senate at the present session of Congress. But, from remarks which he made and from the general course of the bill through the House and through the Congress as a whole, I had rather inferred that hope had gone. However, I am glad now to be advised to the contrary.

That being the case, it is important at this time that the Senate should understand some of the features of this bill and realize the importance of its consideration at this session of Congress, and what may be accomplished if the bill should become a law at this time, and yet not bankrupt the country from a financial point of view.

The Senator from North Dakota, if I was able to understand the purport of his presentation, wanted the Senate to believe that it was important to pass this bill only that the ex-service men might know what they may hope for some time in the future. No intimation was made that the bill might be changed so as to bring about any immediate relief, or to do anything in the immediate future which would carry out to any extent the purposes of this bill, and I want to observe that that position has undoubtedly been the position of this Congress, both in the House and in the Senate.

This is a bill heralded as being for the benefit of the ex-service man. In it are provisions for the payment of a cash bonus, so called.

In it are provisions for an indebtedness certificate. In it are provisions for vocational training, a land-settlement plan, and a home loaning plan. Yet, Mr. President, not a dollar is appropriated by this bill for any purpose, which clearly demonstrates, it seems to me, that the framers of the bill which passed the House did not have it in mind that they were seriously dealing with the situation. After providing for these various plans, what follows? The very last section of the bill reads:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amount as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated!" Why could they not have made the appropriation then and there to carry out the provisions of the bill if they wanted to confer any immediate benefit, or give any immediate relief, or provide for the adjustment of compensation due to these ex-service men? But not a dollar of appropriation is provided in that measure, and I may add that the bill which comes to the Senate now from the Finance Committee likewise does not appropriate a single dollar for the purpose of carrying the provisions of the bill into effect, and the purpose in passing such legislation as is proposed here now must be other than to afford the relief which most of us feel the ex-service men are entitled to.

Further, the bill passed the House on the 20th of last May. From that time to this not a committee of the House has undertaken by any other bill to provide a dollar to bring about the relief suggested in the bill. This bill came over to the Senate, was referred to the Finance Committee along in January, and the Finance Committee for one or two days held some so-called hearings; but from that time until last Thursday the Finance Committee did not move in regard to this bill at all, and on last Thursday, when the committee was called in session, we were met with the information that the Treasury Department was still behind in some of the desired statistics.

On Friday we were met with the same information, and only on Saturday afternoon did the subcommittee which had had this matter under consideration finally submit to the whole committee a report, and that report then was not printed, and not a single copy of that report has been available to any member of the committee, so far as I know, except the one member who drafted it. In that situation, the bill is brought in at this time, on the 28th day of February, 1921, less than four days before the adjournment of this Congress.

What is the country to understand from this situation? Do you believe that the ex-service men, those who sustained this country in its hour of stress, are going to feel that this is a bona fide attempt to relieve them in any way whatsoever?

I know, Mr. President, that much has been said in the press of the country and much has been said upon the floor of the Senate, about the situation of the Treasury of the United States, and it has been suggested that if this bill should become a law, there would be an immediate charge upon the Treasury of about \$2,000,000,000. Of course, if that should be the result, if we might reasonably anticipate such a result, I agree that we could not afford to pass this bill until some provision was made to reimburse the Treasury.

But my judgment is that there is no occasion to bring about a situation which would result in that disaster to the Treasury. There are several of the features suggested by this bill which might be put into operation, which might perform a very wholesome service, and yet not be of sufficient burden to bend the Treasury, or to even tend to bankrupt it, as has been suggested upon the floor of the Senate.

We all have heard something of what has been going on in regard to the finances of this country. We have read with pride how the floating indebtedness of the Government has been reduced during the last year and more, and we have had, through the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, a statement that if \$4,000,000,000 can be raised annually, in the course of the next two or three years we shall be able to retire several billion dollars which the Treasury is anticipating as floating indebtedness of the country, or which will become such.

I make the suggestion that if there is a real necessity, if there is any kind of an obligation which this Government owes to the ex-service men, which can be met, even in part, by the Treasury, without another bond issue, will it not be better to do that than to simply take a pride in reducing the other indebtedness of this country? I think I can show how, through this bill, if properly amended, we can perform a very great service to these men, and that it will not cost the Government in the immediate future anything like what has been suggested or what has been anticipated.

It must be recalled that there are several provisions in the bill. The first provision is the payment of a cash sum of money to the various ex-soldiers, and it is anticipated that if that is to be done, if they would all take the cash at once, it would amount probably to a little less than a billion and a half dollars. Even if we had to pay that, it would be distributed over a period of more than two years. The average would be less than three-quarters of a billion dollars, and if I recall the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, it is expected the floating indebtedness of the country will be reduced by about that amount each year during the next three or four years.

But even if we should defer the cash bonus feature of this bill there is much good that can be accomplished, and to my mind the greatest good that could be accomplished, and with the appropriation of a very small sum of money, relatively speaking. The next item of the bill provides for the issuance of adjusted service certificates. By putting into operation that part of the bill, not a dollar would be necessary to meet any of those certificates under at least two years.

There is no reason, so far as I know, why we should not go ahead and put into operation the provisions of Title III, providing for the adjusted service certificates. Those, in effect, as stated by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota who presents the bill, are endowment insurance policies, with a loan feature. They can not borrow any money on them for two years, but they are insurance policies. Some of the soldiers will die within the next two years, and unless the bill be passed

and that feature be put into operation there will have been made no provision for the ex-service men or their families or the dependents of those who may die during the next two or three years or before the bill goes into operation.

It does seem to me that this is a provision of the bill which ought to receive the immediate favorable action of the Senate. I do not see how the House can oppose it. They have already passed a bill with that provision in it. If Senators mean what they say, why not put it into operation and let the ex-service men begin to get the benefit of it, when the money part of the bill to any measurable extent will be deferred for several years to come?

The next title of the bill, Title IV, is the one which relates to vocational training aid. It does seem to me, if the Congress owes to these people anything in the nature of vocational training aid, that we ought to provide for it immediately. The statement has been made to the committee that the average age of the ex-service men at the time of their discharge from the Army was 25 years. Their average age next year will be 28. If we are going to provide vocational training aid for a man, should we not provide it before he is 30 years of age? If he is going to prepare himself to follow a vocation in life, when are we going to prepare him? Are we going to wait until he is 30 years of age or more and then offer him something in the way of vocational training? It does seem to me that that provision of the bill ought to be put into operation now if we mean to offer any assistance to those for whom the provision was intended. Is vocational training aid to be deferred until the ex-service men average 30 years of age? I do not believe the Congress intends that.

I do not believe there is any reason why there should not be an appropriation which will carry that feature of the bill into effect. Just recently in the Senate we have authorized the Treasurer of the United States to purchase \$200,000,000 of bonds of the farm land banks. Fortunately the Supreme Court of the United States to-day has decided that the bonds issued by that bank are constitutional, and the country will now take those bonds and it will not be necessary for the Treasury of the United States to buy them. So, may I not ask that we should at least provide \$100,000,000 of that sum for the purpose of instituting vocational training aid provisions of the bill—just \$100,000,000?

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] just a little while ago pointed out where we could save \$106,000,000 in a reduction of the naval appropriations. Why not apply that to furnishing vocational aid for the ex-service men if we ever expect to do it at all? Of course, if Senators desire to camouflage the situation, if they desire to make some one believe something without any substance behind it, it is not necessary to do this thing. But if they really intend to let these young men have vocational training which will fit them for the walks of life, let us do it now when they are entering life, when they are seeking their vocation, when they are entering upon their business careers. Let us do it now. I submit that an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for the purpose of carrying into effect Title IV of the bill would not be any great burden upon the Treasury at this time, certainly not a burden as compared to the benefits which the men would derive from it. If they are ever entitled to any such provision, let us give it to them now, give it to them while it will do them good, and start them out in life at a much earlier period.

The next title of the bill, Title VI, is called the land-settlement provision. To my mind that is a most wholesome provision of the bill. It was stated that a large number of ex-service men had already expressed their desire for farms. The land-settlement plan does not provide alone for the irrigation of lands in the West, but provides for drainage of lands, for putting into proper condition the cut-over lands of the country, millions of acres, and for doing something in each State in the Union, if possible, to provide homes and farms for the ex-service men. I heartily approve of the plan. It passed the House and has been reported out to the Senate by the Committee on Finance. No one particularly objected to that feature of the bill, but unfortunately at the conclusion of Title VI we find this provision:

The board shall for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and annually thereafter, submit to Congress estimates of the amount necessary to be expended by it in executing the provisions of this title.

Then follows this remarkable provision:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the aggregate sum of \$250,000,000, to be available for expenditure by the board, in accordance with the provisions of this title, during a period not to exceed 10 years after the passage of this act.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. The report not yet having been printed, I am unable to ascertain without inquiry what the report shows. I wish to ask the Senator whether in the action of the committee on the bill they have stricken out the land-settlement provision?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. No; that provision is not stricken out; but there is no provision made for carrying it into effect.

Mr. NORRIS. I remember an hour or two ago listening to the very interesting explanation of the bill by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], but I do not believe there was any estimate made in that explanatory statement with regard to the land-settlement part of the bill. I should like to inquire whether the committee considered that feature?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I must say to the Senator that I do not recall that there was any mention made in the report of the committee about that feature of the bill. I do not recall any, but that feature of the bill was left in the bill to be reported to the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I heard the Senator make the statement just a few moments ago that he regarded that as an important feature of the bill. I gave some attention to the bill at the time it came over from the House, and I myself thought that the part of the bill which would result in the greatest benefit to the country and to the men was the land-settlement part of it. I was always in doubt as to just how many or what proportion of men would choose it, but in talking with a great many of the former soldiers I have found that almost without exception they regard that as the best part of the bill, some of them going so far as to say that perhaps there ought to be something put in the bill to make it more likely that more of them would choose that provision.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I am very glad the Senator from Nebraska has made the suggestion and that he realizes the importance of that provision of the bill. I certainly agree with the view he has expressed. I see no reason why there should not now be made an appropriation sufficient to start this great work. The bill provides for \$250,000,000 in 10 years. Why not let us provide \$25,000,000 of it right now?

Let us consider for a moment that provision of the bill. When do we expect to furnish homes for the ex-service men? If we start upon that work immediately, it will be months before a single one of them can avail himself of the benefits of that provision. If we believe that is a thing which should come to them and be done, why not begin now and appropriate \$25,000,000 to begin the work? We have got to organize a force, we have to select the projects, we have got to find the lands which we wish to reclaim, whether by irrigation, drainage, or otherwise, and under the terms of the bill we should find land, if feasible, in every State in the Union. If this is to be done, why not start now? It does seem to me that unless the Congress desires to camouflage the situation it will make an appropriation at least to carry this feature of the bill into effect.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator is a member of the committee which had the bill in charge. While I listened as carefully as I could when the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] was describing the report, there were times when by reason of confusion in the Chamber I could not follow him. I wish to ask the Senator if I have reached a correct understanding of the report. I understand that as far as the adjusted service pay is concerned the committee have changed the bill as it came from the House by substituting January, 1923, for July 1, 1921, as the date of the commencement of the quarterly payments. Is that correct?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is true.

Mr. PITTMAN. In addition to that, I understand the bill makes no appropriation looking to the carrying out of those payments, and that it makes no appropriation for the organization of the various commissions provided for in the bill?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The bill does not appropriate a single dollar for any purpose.

Mr. PITTMAN. And all of the provisions of the House bill under Title VII, entitled "Victory taxes," providing for an additional surtax on incomes, stock and bond taxes, produce-exchange taxes, and so forth, which was the method provided by the House for raising sufficient funds to meet the requirements of the bill, have been stricken out?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Every provision in the bill as it came from the House for the purpose of providing the means for raising revenue has been stricken from the bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. As I interpret that state of facts, so far as adjusted service pay is concerned, that is practically indefinitely

postponed; in other words, the Senate committee promises the ex-service men that in 1923 it is their intention to proceed along the lines stated in the bill so far as adjusting service pay is concerned, but is it not a fact—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If the Senator will pardon me, I believe the proposition might be stated in this way: The bill as now reported to the Senate amounts in effect to a mere statement by this Congress that this Congress is willing that some future Congress may provide some means of paying these men an adjusted service pay.

Mr. PITTMAN. What I was going to state is this: As I understand, the promise by one Congress that another Congress shall do a certain thing is not binding in any way; that it is not even considered morally binding, is it, on subsequent Congresses?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Not in the slightest degree. This bill only provides that these things shall be done provided some future Congress shall make an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. PITTMAN. Then the ex-service men are in no better position than if they should bring the matter to the attention of the Congress which will be in session on January, 1923?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I can not see how they can receive any material benefit from the bill. Of course, there is one thing it will do: It will provide legislation, so that when we come to the consideration of some general appropriation bill, if the Appropriations Committee desires so to do, it may put an appropriation on a general appropriation bill providing for the execution of this measure. That, to my mind, is the only real effect the passage of this bill will have—to enable an appropriating committee in the future, in some general appropriation bill, to make provision for the purpose contemplated, because it would then be authorized by law.

Mr. PITTMAN. The reason I have asked the questions is this: I am receiving telegrams to-day suggesting that there has been a favorable report upon this bill by the committee and urging me to support the report. I know that those who are wiring me do not understand what the report is, because some of the telegrams state that the committee have reported favorably on the bill as prepared and suggested by the legion. I want it definitely understood that I shall not vote for the committee amendment changing the date as it is provided in the House bill from January, 1921, to January, 1923; but notwithstanding that—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If the Senator will pardon me, I might make this suggestion: To my mind it is wholly immaterial whether the Senator votes for that amendment or not, because even if that amendment is not made this bill could not furnish a single dollar to any one of the ex-service men. So it is immaterial whether the amendment is put in or not, according to my view of the matter.

Mr. PITTMAN. Do not the ex-service men, so far as the Senator from New Mexico knows, expect some benefit from this proposed act?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I will say to the Senator from Nevada that all of the opposition in the press that I have read which has been directed toward this bill is based on the ground that if it should become a law there would be an immediate drain upon the Treasury which it could not stand, but when the bill is analyzed it is found that it can not drain a single dollar out of the Treasury.

Mr. PITTMAN. I wish to say, Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—and I do not want to take up any time with further speeches on the matter—that I am deeply interested in this question. I do not believe our soldiers since their return have received the consideration to which they are entitled. I think we have forgotten the sacrifices that they made for those who stayed at home; I think we have forgotten the suffering which they endured; I imagine we are thinking more of the reduction in our incomes than we are of doing justice to these men whom we can never repay. We have caused them to wait now for two years. They have been waiting not for a bill to be passed which provides that some day we shall put in force and effect legislation in their behalf, but they have been waiting to have such legislation put into effect now; yet we are proposing to put them off longer and longer. Senators may feel that the tax situation of the country requires delay; and yet the other House provided a method of taxation that would raise the necessary funds, as I understand.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to deny that, Mr. President. The House provided nothing of the kind. The bill that was sent over here would not raise the necessary funds. I have heard a good deal of demagogic utterances on this whole subject. While I am not the chairman of the Committee on Finance, that committee have reported the bill, and Senators can make the

bill what they wish in the Senate. They will have an opportunity to do so. The time that is taken up in discussing it in connection with another bill, a motion to consider which is now pending, is time lost. I will join with the Senators to-morrow, if they wish to vote the necessary funds, to make a cash payment or anything else they may see fit, but the criticisms that are attempted to be made are unfounded.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] is a member of the Committee on Finance. I have heard none of these criticisms urged before that committee. I have heard of no great assistance being rendered or any particular effort to get the bill hurried through the committee by the Senator.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I have been ready to take up the matter with him at any time, being friendly to this proposition. The Senator knows as well as I do that we have got to represent both the interests of the soldier and the interests of the tax-paying public. The Senator knows that there are those upon the committee who are desperately opposed to this bill being passed at all at this session. The Senator knows as well as I do that in April we will have Congress in session and that any appropriation bill necessary to carry out what shall be agreed upon to be the law can be put through the proper appropriating committee. That is what the committee has had in view. The Senator from Nevada knows that the Committee on Finance is not an appropriating committee; it simply provides the machinery, and the Committee on Appropriations provides the money to take care of the measure under proper estimates.

The committee which has reported this bill have acted in the best of faith. I would fix a little earlier time than the last of December, 1922; but that is for the Senate to determine when the bill comes before it. If we get the pending bill out of the way we will have the other one before us very quickly for disposition.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I trust that the Senator from North Dakota may be willing to withdraw one expression which he used in his recent remarks, to the effect that he had heard enough demagoguery on this bill. I want to say to the Senator that that is a word which I have not yet used, but if we consider the history of this bill from the time that it started in the House of Representatives until this good hour it seems to me that somebody else has the right to use the word which the Senator from North Dakota has employed. He certainly does not intend to apply that word to me, because he knows that the Finance Committee did not have the bill under consideration until Thursday of last week. Where was the opportunity to study the bill?

The Senator from North Dakota also knows that I have been asking him for a copy of his report. The Senator from North Dakota further knows that on last Saturday, when the Committee on Finance decided to report the bill, we then only had a report, which he read to the committee. We had no opportunity to suggest amendments; and on that occasion I specifically reserved the right to propose amendments in the Senate. A statement or inference as to dereliction in working with the committee is wholly unwarranted by the facts.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. I was just about to finish a sentence when interrupted. I merely wish to say that while the House did not provide, as has been stated, the means or funds through taxation to raise this amount to cover the full period of years, they did provide, as I understand—and I am not a member of the Finance Committee, but base my statement on a hasty examination of the bill as it comes from the committee—for the raising of large sums of money through increasing taxes on large incomes and also upon stock sales and transactions of that kind on stock exchanges which would take care of the immediate needs. I do not know why the money can not be raised if it is desired to tax those who have the incomes with which to pay it.

Of course, I understand that when you attempt to raise the taxes much higher a great many more people will complain, but that does not concern me at all; and if it is demagoguery to be willing to take part of the profits—not the principal but a part more of the profits—away from those who have made enormous profits out of the war, and pay it to those men who sacrificed and suffered for us, that our liberties might endure and that we might live in peace and prosperity, then I welcome the charge of demagoguery.

And so it seems to appear from arguments that to save the incomes is statesmanship and to attempt to do justice to our soldiers is demagoguery.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am very much in sympathy with what the Senator has been saying. This bill having passed the House, there might be a possibility of taking some action in the Senate and getting an agreement; but, of course, we can not consider two bills at the same time, and if the Senator will allow us to proceed with the naval appropriation bill and get it out of the way, I will join with him in an effort to accomplish the object that he has so well stated.

I hope, therefore, the Senator will allow us to go ahead with the naval bill.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I am always glad to accommodate my cordial friend from Washington when I think it can be done without detriment to the public interest; but from the remarks which I listened to this afternoon from the Senator from Idaho I am quite convinced that it would be a useless waste of time to take up the naval bill now, in the closing days of this session. The Senator from Idaho did not say that he was determined that that bill should not pass; but when a Senator, loquacious, eloquent, well informed, announces to the Senate that certain features of such a bill should be considered deliberately and at length I think we all understand just what that means. So I believe that it would be a waste of time to take up that bill, and, if I were unkind enough, it seems to me the observation would be justified that when this bill is brought upon the floor of the Senate and presented to it—this bill which I deem to be an emergency measure, a bill which promises some result—when I see this bill presented to the Senate without any effort to bring it up for consideration, and upon the other side of the Chamber a motion is made to take up the naval bill when we all know what the ultimate result probably will be, it would seem to indicate that there was some plan somewhere to prevent this bill from becoming a law at this session of Congress.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. Is it not true that when the bill was before the committee a vote was had on the question whether the date should be made January 1, 1923, or whether the date in the House bill of July 1, 1921, should be retained? I know that the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Rhode Island voted for the 1921 date.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is correct.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] was opposed to this, and I am very glad to see that apparently from his statement on the floor he has rather changed his mind about it and thinks that an earlier date than January 1, 1923, may be set.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, the truth of the situation is, as I understand—and I do not blame the Senator from North Dakota for that situation, either—that this matter has been deferred until the closing hours of this Congress, and the conclusion has been finally reached that this Senate must do something, must take some action, or must meet with the resentment which will necessarily come from these ex-service men and their friends and the other patriotic citizens of this country who believe that they should receive some kind of compensation for the services which they have contributed to the country.

I do not blame the Senator from North Dakota. If I recall correctly, he was appointed chairman of the subcommittee only a short time ago, and I believe I have heard him make the statement in committee that from that time to the present he has been hard at work on the bill. So I acquit him of any intention to delay this bill or of any intention to take any teeth out of it, if it ever had any teeth in it, but this is the situation which confronts us and the country now, and it does seem to me that it devolves upon us to take this situation in hand and deal with it so as to bring about some affirmative result and to do something to show that we mean what we pretend to mean.

Mr. President, there are three things which it seems to me can be done here without the employment of very much money.

The Senate Finance Committee proposes to strike out the provisions of this bill for raising the funds by taxation. No consideration really has been given by the committee to that feature, except in the most perfunctory way. It may be that the provisions in this bill for raising funds are not what they should be, that we can raise this money in some other way, the large amount, if it should ever be necessary, but I want to refer to another feature of this bill which in all probability will make

it unnecessary at any time to raise any very large sum of money, as has been suggested in the report of the chairman of the committee.

To my mind, there is a very unwise provision on page 3 of this bill. For instance, it provides:

Applications for adjusted-service pay shall be made within six months after the passage of this act.

Applications for adjusted-service certificates shall be made within one year after the passage of this act.

Applications for vocational training aid or for farm or home aid shall be made within one year after the passage of this act.

Applications for land-settlement aid shall be made within one year after the passage of this act.

And then it says:

Any application not made within the time provided therefor shall be held void.

I can not for the life of me conceive any reason for putting such a provision as that into this bill. I have heard it said by many ex-service men that they do not want anything from this Government of ours at this time; that they do not need it; that they do not want anything, and would not accept the provisions of this bill if they were entitled to them. Now, then, why limit the time within which the application may be filed? That same ex-service man through his patriotism might decline to accept any adjustment of pay at this time, but in the mutations of time circumstances may change, and then he would be confronted with this provision:

Any application not made within the time provided therefor shall be held void.

Do we want to make any such provision as that? Moreover, do we want to force the ex-service man within the next six months to say whether he wants to take the adjusted pay, or whether he wants to take a certificate, or whether he wants to take a home settlement or vocational training? Do you want to force him to do that within the next six months?

Fellow Senators, how can the ex-service man decide in six months whether he wants to take a home-settlement benefit or not? No selection of the homes has been made. We do not know where the projects are going to be; and to force him to make his selection within six months, or be forever barred, is doing him an absolute injustice, and the effect of it will be to force practically all of them to choose the bonus or cash payment plan. That, indeed, might and would make a great burden upon the Treasury; but if you defer the time or have the time unlimited within which the selection may be made, I imagine that thousands and hundreds of thousands of these men will not make their selection now. They will want to wait and see what the home-settlement plan is going to amount to. They will want to wait and see whether they desire to take an adjusted-service certificate. They might want to wait and determine to borrow the money for the purchase of a home or a farm as provided in this bill; but if you force them to make a decision now you force them to select the payment of this sum in cash, and to my mind they ought to be discouraged from accepting cash just as much as we can possibly do it.

Another provision that we might put in this bill is this: We passed a few years ago what is known as a stock-grazing homestead law. We propose to give to a settler upon the public domain 640 acres of land if he will go there and improve it. He does not have to live on it, but we give it to him if he will simply go there and improve it. Now, the reason why those lands have not been improved and taken up under that law is this: Six hundred and forty acres of those lands is not enough to enable a man to go and establish a little stock ranch and make a living on the land. So I have prepared an amendment to this bill, providing that an ex-service man may purchase of those lands 1,280 acres at \$1.25 an acre, and have his adjusted-service pay applied to the purchase price.

I have the amendment prepared here, and I submit that there can be no valid reason suggested why this plan should not be adopted; and if it is adopted it will afford homes, it will afford aid to hundreds and thousands of these ex-service men, and will not cost this Government a dollar. Why should not that be done?

I provide that those lands which have been classified under the stock-grazing homestead law may be purchased at \$1.25 an acre, or that other lands of less value, which have been classified as of less value and are put outside the stock-grazing homestead law because they are not of sufficient value, may be purchased. So the amendment is limited to that. I propose that we appropriate \$100,000,000 for the purpose of furnishing vocational training if the ex-service men want it, \$25,000,000 for the purpose of starting the home-settlement feature of this bill, and then I propose to put in this amendment allowing the soldiers to purchase these lands upon the public domain and get them into private ownership, private use, and have them become sub-

ject to taxation for State purposes. I provide that the cash proceeds, derived therefrom shall be divided, one half going to the State where the land is found, and the other half going to the Reclamation Fund, the half going to the State to be appropriated as the legislature may provide for either common public schools or the building of roads.

So, Mr. President, I offer the three amendments which I have had prepared, and ask that they may be printed as proposed amendments to the bill. I will state also that while I have prepared no amendment I shall, on consideration of the bill, move to strike out, on page 3, lines 5 to 24, inclusive, being all of those provisions requiring the ex-service man to make his selection within a limited time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] to House bill 14157 will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, it does seem to me that in this late hour of this Congress it would be a waste of time to take up the naval appropriation bill, which is now sought to be brought up, and instead of doing that I hope the Senate will take up this adjusted-compensation bill and consider it. Let us put it in shape. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] very properly suggested that if the bill is not in shape the Senate could take hold of it and put it in shape. Let us do it. Let us not waste our time in considering a bill which can accomplish no result and which can as well be considered at the special session of the next Congress.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] is a member of the Committee on Finance. I have been a member of that committee for some years. In all my experience I have never known of a time when the committee would not at any time suggested by any Member call up any bill before the committee for amendment or for suggestion. I know that it was in the power of the Senator from New Mexico to request a meeting to consider any part of any bill at any time, and that a meeting would have been called especially at his request. I do not think it lies in the mouth of anyone to say that that committee, of which he is a member, has not acted expeditiously upon any bill, when the power was in his hands, as well as in those of other members of the committee, to bring about action at any time if he thought there was any delay.

But, Mr. President, there has been a great deal of work not only before that committee but before every committee of the Senate in the present short session.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator with pleasure.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I desire to make this statement in response to what the Senator has just said: I have not been a member of this body as long as the Senator from North Dakota, but if any such rule prevails as he has just announced I must say I have never heard of it before.

If it was within the power of a single member of the committee to bring together a meeting of the committee this is the first time that information has come to my ears. The Senator, it does seem to me, in his great spirit of fairness, ought to observe, what seems to be the prevailing opinion in this body as well as throughout the country, that the chairman of the committee and a few on the majority side of the committee control absolutely the proceedings of the committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee is not the whole committee in any one of the committees of the Senate, and he is not in the Finance Committee. The chairman of the Finance Committee has been absent a great part of the time on account of sickness. There has never been a time in which any member of that committee has asked for a meeting when the member next below the chairman has not immediately proceeded to ask the committee to meet in response to the request of that member, and it would not make any difference whether that member was on the minority or the majority side.

Mr. President, let us deal honestly with the subject. Let us not try to play upon anybody or for any purpose. Let us deal fairly by the country, and deal fairly by the committee, and fairly by the people who have to pay the taxes. We are confronted with an enormous deficit. The people of the country are tax burdened. The American people are generous, generous even to a fault, and more than generous at all times toward those who fight their battles. The man who goes into the Army or Navy has never had just cause to complain of the impulse of the American people to do the right thing by him at all times.

But, Mr. President, we know we are confronted with conditions that are not at all agreeable. The country at the present time, so far as business is concerned, is almost prostrated. We have to raise by taxation very large sums to meet our liabilities. I be-

lieve we can meet this added liability in the way I have suggested, without any additional taxation whatever.

The Senator from New Mexico criticizes the Senate committee, or seems to criticize it, because of some provisions in the bill as it passed the House. We had hearings, and most of those hearings were given over to those who were ex-service men, who represented the American Legion, and other organizations of those men. Their testimony uniformly was that they were entirely satisfied with the bill as it passed the House. They were not desirous of having any amendments, and preferred that there should be none.

When it came to the question as to the time when it should go into effect we were assured that they would have confidence that the Congress would make it applicable as soon as the conditions of the country would warrant it, and that whatever the Congress did they would be satisfied with it; and I am certain that that is their sentiment.

I admit that a difference of 18 months, between July 1, 1921, and December, 1922, measures quite an extent in the lives of those who desire to take advantage of two provisions; that is, the land provision and that providing for industrial education. But that can be fixed in the Senate to whatever time the Senate thinks would be the proper time. I am satisfied that 95 per cent of the men, at least, will choose either the cash or the insurance or certificate proposition, and those are the provisions which will cost the greatest sum of money to the American people.

Therefore in making this report I was careful to cover the minimum and also the possible maximum cost, and then gave tables showing the figures all the way between those two extremes, to show what would be the probable cost to the American people, and even independent of the action of the committee, I made an additional suggestion, which I thought proper, as to how the money might be raised without any additional taxation whatever. I believe it can be done, and I believe we could probably begin at a little earlier date if the Senate thought proper. But I do not think we should select July 1, 1921, because we are too near that date at the present time to raise the necessary revenue to provide the bills for it and to put in action the machinery which will be necessary. I want to give the ex-soldier sufficient time to be educated as to just exactly what these provisions mean to him before he is called upon even to exercise his judgment at all, and I think six months should be the least number of months that should be allowed for this purpose before he is even required to make any selection whatever.

The committee is acting in the best of faith. I stated in my presentation this morning that, whatever date we fix, I thought we ought to put it right through now, so that when we meet in April we can immediately prepare our revenue and our appropriation bills to meet the estimated requirements of the bill.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question bearing upon the remarks which he has just made. As I understood the Senator, he said that the bill was satisfactory to the ex-service men.

Mr. McCUMBER. I stated that, according to the testimony, as the bill passed the House it was satisfactory to the ex-service men, and I stated, as to those who were before us, just what the testimony showed.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to ask the Senator, in this connection, if he does not understand that the ex-service men, in expressing such approval of the bill, understood that the bill made provision for the payment of money?

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Does the bill make any such provision?

Mr. McCUMBER. The bill as it passed the House makes provision for the payment of the money, and of course so does the bill that we have reported. The only difference is the time when the payments shall begin, and the Senate will fix the exact date, when it passes upon this bill, I assume. Inasmuch as there is so much difference between those who take an extreme view and those who wish to take a moderate view, as to the proper time, I for one thought it was best to determine that matter in the Senate itself, and gave the two dates. The Senator knows that it was voted in the committee to put the date off to a still further time, even a year later, which of course was voted down.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Will the Senator permit another question?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Does the Senator want us to understand that if the bill were to become a law as it passed the House, or as reported to the Senate, the ex-service man

would get a dollar under it, without further legislation by Congress?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I do not care what kind of a law we pass that is necessary to fix a monetary obligation upon the country, we have to depend upon Congress to make appropriations for the payments. Does any officer in the Army or Navy know that he is going to be paid two years from now? Yes; he knows that, his salary being fixed, that Congress will make the necessary appropriation. Do the soldiers know that they are going to be paid if we pass a law which provides that they shall be paid? Certainly, they know that Congress will make appropriate provision in the appropriation bills for the payments.

We do not know to-day exactly how much money will be paid each year. We can not know until the applications begin to come in.

If we pass the bill to-day, we can make a fair estimate. Even if we fix on July 1, 1921, as the date for the beginning of payments, we can make a fair estimate as to how much will be required before the end of the next fiscal year, and between April 4 and June 30 of 1921 we can pass an appropriation bill to cover the estimate. It is not necessary, it not only is not necessary but it is not proper that the bill should carry the appropriation to make the payments that will be made during all of the next 20 years.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, the bill passed the House on the 20th of last May. It provided for the operation of the adjusted service pay beginning on the 1st of July, 1921, just a few months from the present time. Even if the Senator from North Dakota believes that the Appropriations Committee will make appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such a bill as this, has there been any attempt on the part of the Committee on Appropriations of the House even to consider any legislation looking toward the actual appropriation of money for the purpose, and should the ex-service men be satisfied with this legislation which alone would not provide the payment of a single dollar?

Mr. McCUMBER. The time to make an appropriation for any law is when we know what the law will be. When a bill is passed which provides for many and devious ways through which we are to determine the amount which will be necessary, we have got to wait until we see what the law is and then trust the proper Appropriations Committee to make the appropriation. I will guarantee to the Senator that if we pass the bill at this session there will be an appropriation made, even though it takes effect July 1, 1921, and I could add a like guaranty that if it passes at any time before July 1, 1921, the necessary appropriation will be made to carry it into effect. I would rather have it passed now. I think it ought to pass before we begin the consideration of our revenue bill, because the revenue bill should be framed in accordance with the requirements of the Government, and we should know the additional requirements just as soon as possible.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOWNSEND in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 15975, the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. On that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). May I inquire if the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has voted? The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. KNOX. I withhold my vote, being paired with that Senator.

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY]. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] and vote "yea."

Mr. FERNALD. Making the same announcement as before, I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINGS] and vote "yea."

Mr. KNOX. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and vote "yea."

Mr. McCUMBER (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. GERRY. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]; and

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS].

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 7, as follows:

YEAS—43.

Ball	Gooding	Moses	Stanley
Brandeggio	Hale	New	Sterling
Calder	Heflin	Overman	Sutherland
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Townsend
Curtis	Kellogg	Poinexter	Trammell
Dial	Keyes	Pomorenne	Underwood
Elkins	Knox	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Fernald	Lenroot	Simmons	Warren
Fletcher	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	Willis
France	McCumber	Smoot	Wolcott
Gerry	McKellar	Spencer	

NAYS—7.

Borah	Kenyon	La Follette	Smith, S. C.
Jones, N. Mex.	King	Norris	

NOT VOTING—46.

Asburt	Gore	McNary	Sherman
Beckham	Gronna	Myers	Shields
Chamberlain	Harris	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Coit	Harrison	Newberry	Smith, Md.
Culberson	Henderson	Owen	Swanson
Cummings	Hitchcock	Page	Thomas
Dillingham	Johnson, Calif.	Penrose	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	Kendrick	Pittman	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Ransdell	Williams
Gay	McCormick	Reed	
Glass	McLean	Robinson	

So Mr. POINDEXTER's motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 15975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the formal reading of the bill, that the bill be read for amendments, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator from Washington if it is the intention to-night, after he has held the Senate as long as he desires, to take a recess or adjourn?

Mr. POINDEXTER. To take a recess. I ask unanimous consent that when we conclude the sitting to-night, the Senate shall take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. That is a point concerning which I desire to be informed. I gave notice a day or two ago, under Rule XL, of a motion to suspend the rules, and since that time we have been taking a recess and have had no adjournment. Do I understand that my notice would be available notwithstanding the fact we have had no adjournment?

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is my understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opinion of the Chair is that the rule which has been followed is that a calendar day must elapse. Inasmuch as that rule has been followed, the Chair thinks the motion of the Senator would be in order, and that the rule would apply to the notice given by the Senator from Idaho.

The Senator from Washington has submitted a request for unanimous consent to dispense with the formal reading of the bill, and that the bill be read for amendments, and that committee amendments be first considered.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not wish to object, but I desire to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that to-morrow at 10.30 and 11 o'clock a number of committees are to meet. I have two such meetings—I think the purpose is to conclude a number of pending and important matters—and perhaps they will be the last meetings of the committees, and doubtless a large number of other committees are meeting. If the

Senator could make it 12 o'clock, it would give us a chance to get rid of those important matters.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will say to the Senator from Utah, so far as his committee meetings are concerned, that if he will allow us to proceed at 11 o'clock, if any matter in which he is interested should come up during his committee meeting I shall be very glad to have it go over until he can be here.

Mr. KING. I do not want to object, but I thought my suggestion might be in the interest of economy of time and the expedition of business.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, I desire to say I hope the Senator from Utah will not object to making it 11 o'clock, because it is better to meet at 11 o'clock than to add an hour at night, and that is what would have to be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Washington is granted.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The second request which I desire to make is that when the Senate concludes its sitting to-day it take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has heard the request of the Senator from Washington. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REFERENCE OF NOMINATIONS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have referred to the Committee on Commerce, as in open executive session, certain nominations—1 in the Steamboat-Inspection Service, 11 in the Coast Guard, and 17 in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. SMOOT. Those were the nominations asked to be referred to which I objected the other day, but I find, upon examination, that they are regular promotions, just the same as the regular promotions in the Army or Navy. Therefore I have no objection to the course suggested by the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Washington is granted.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I have asked that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read for amendments, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary is following the usual procedure in such cases.

Mr. BORAH. I do not understand that by granting the request of the Senator from Washington the Secretary is relieved from reading the bill. The bill is now being read for committee amendments, but the bill has to be read.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, if the Senator from Idaho desires the entire bill to be read, that is all right.

Mr. BORAH. I understood that the Senator from Washington had simply asked to dispense with the formal reading of the bill and to have it read for committee amendments. That is what the Secretary is now doing. I repeat, the bill has to be read.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator desires it, of course, that is all right; but I thought it would save time simply to read the amendments.

Mr. KING. I should like to have the bill read.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The first amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 2, line 14, after the word "employees," to insert "and for mileage, at 5 cents per mile, to midshipmen entering the Naval Academy while proceeding from their homes to the Naval Academy for examination and appointment as midshipmen," so as to read:

PAY, MISCELLANEOUS.

For commissions and interest; transportation of funds; exchange; mileage to officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve Force while traveling under orders in the United States, and for actual personal expenses of officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve Force while traveling abroad under orders, and for traveling expenses of civilian employees; and for mileage, at 5 cents per mile, to midshipmen entering the Naval Academy while proceeding from their homes to the Naval Academy for examination and appointment as midshipmen.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 14, under the heading, "Pay, miscellaneous," to increase the appropriation "for telephone rentals and tolls, telegrams and cablegrams, postage," etc., from "\$250,000" to "\$400,000."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the first item which we encounter in the consideration of the pending bill calling for an appropriation is an increase over that carried by the House bill. The House appropriation with reference to this item called for \$250,000, while the bill, as reported by the Senate committee, carries \$400,000. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] a few moments ago called attention to the fact that the bill increases the appropriations carried by the House bill by more than \$105,000,000.

Mr. President, an examination of the testimony and the bill, in my opinion, fails to justify these tremendous increases. I do not recall at this moment the various estimates which constitute this aggregate sum of \$400,000; but the House committee examined into these items—and I say it with all due respect to the Senate committee—with far more particularity than did the Senate committee. Yet, Mr. President, an examination of the House hearings discloses how pitifully imperfect is the information which is furnished. I have not the time to take up the specific items concerning which testimony was given in the House; but an examination of almost any one of them selected at random will show that substantially all the testimony was given by interested naval officers or persons representing the Navy Department. Of course, it would be unparliamentary, and perhaps improper, upon my part to comment upon the procedure employed by the other branch of the legislative body in obtaining data as the basis of projected legislation, and particularly appropriation bills; but I aver—and I do not think the statement can be successfully controverted—that the testimony adduced before the House Naval Committee with respect to the items carried in the House naval appropriation bill was wholly inadequate to enable legislators intelligently to act.

Some representative of the Navy Department interested in the appropriation appears before the House committee. Already the House has been advised from estimates which have been furnished by the Navy Department that the Navy wants appropriations of given sums for specific or general purposes. Senators will keep in mind the fact that the estimates which were submitted by the Navy Department exceeded the House bill and the Senate bill by several hundred million dollars, as I now recall. In support of those estimates representatives of various bureaus or executive agencies of the Navy Department appear before the House committee, which considers the estimates, and reference is made to some estimate of \$100,000 or \$1,000,000 or \$40,000,000, and then in a perfunctory manner statements are submitted with respect to the estimates which have been furnished. The testimony which has been adduced for the guidance of Senators is, in my opinion, insufficient to enable them to reach an intelligent and rational conclusion with respect to the various items for which appropriations are sought. Mr. President, the hearings are practically ex parte; interested witnesses appear, while the taxpayer is not represented. Others who might throw additional light upon the various items and who are not interested or who are seeking the welfare of the taxpayers are not before the committee; countervailing evidence is not submitted, and the record is made up on the ex parte statements of interested witnesses.

I do not want to speak in disparagement of the honor, the integrity, of the high character of the personnel of the Navy. I believe that the naval officers of the United States in all of the essentials embraced within the terms, character and manhood, measure up to a very high standard; yet human nature manifests itself even in naval officers as it exhibits itself in all persons in every walk of life. We are governed more or less by self-interest; persons are influenced more or less by the question of benefits and advantages which may flow directly or indirectly either to them or to a cause in which they are deeply interested. So, Mr. President, unconsciously, by reason of that natural trait of human character, we are oftentimes led to support measures which do not deserve success, and we earnestly and jealously push to a successful issue policies which careful scrutiny and dispassionate consideration would convince us are improper or at least imprudent and improvident.

The very fact that the estimates which are submitted by the Navy Department and by other executive agencies of the Government exceed by hundreds of millions, and, indeed, by billions of dollars the revenues of the Government, is conclusive evidence that the estimates which are submitted should receive the most careful scrutiny at the hands of both the House and Senate; and, indeed, is evidence that those preparing the estimates are not always guided by a desire for the public welfare.

Moreover, Mr. President, as a corollary to that observation it is evident that the testimony which they give before these committees in support of the estimates—and the testimony, of course, is absolutely in line with the estimates—must be taken

with caution, if not distrust, and ought to be weighed by the legislative branches of the Government with the utmost care, and judgment should not be reached unless the testimony and the facts clearly point the way.

Mr. President, I have been astounded and indeed grieved at the estimates which have been furnished from time to time by executive departments of the Government since I have been a Member of this body. There seems to be a rivalry between departments as to which can submit the largest estimates and obtain the largest appropriations from the Treasury of the United States. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], if I understood his statement correctly, made the observation a few moments ago, when he was discussing the bonus bill, that there was a deficit now, or would be a deficit with the appropriation bills now before the Senate, of considerably more than \$2,000,000,000; and he stated, as I remember his figures, that in the event that certain legislation were enacted the deficit would be three billion four hundred or five hundred millions of dollars.

Mr. President, such sums as those mentioned by the Senator would silence even my distinguished friend who is championing this bill in the Senate—a deficit of \$2,000,000,000 confronting the Republican Party after it has been in power in the legislative branch of the Government but two years! The revenues which are being derived under existing law have wrung from the people billions of dollars. As I recall, we will obtain from the various revenue bills now in force approximately \$5,000,000,000 for the current year. There was a time, not very far in the past, when our appropriations scarcely exceeded a billion dollars. The appropriations for the first two years of Republican control of the legislative branch of the Government will exceed \$5,000,000,000 per annum, and the two years of their control of the House and the Senate will find them, notwithstanding these stupendous taxes collected from the people, with a deficit of more than \$2,000,000,000.

I think that that statement is modest. I think the deficit will exceed that amount, because the revenue for the current year, because of the decrease in the business of the country, will be materially reduced; and with the reduction in the revenue there will, of course, be an increase in the deficit which is being incurred as a result of these tremendous expenditures.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] just read an excerpt from a letter written by a business man in the West, speaking about the demoralized condition of business, the despair that has taken possession of the cattle and sheep men, and the general paralysis that exists in the industrial life of the people. From the high tide of a splendid and beneficent prosperity which resulted from Democratic ascendancy, we are now confronted with business paralysis in all parts of the land, despair in business circles, stagnation in the economic life of the Republic, and industrial unrest, indeed almost turbulence, in many portions of the United States.

Mr. President, it was announced following the great victory of the Republican Party that stocks would rise, that there would be increased activity in all branches of business and that the prosperity of this country would be the greatest in its history. Republicans foresaw, so they said, an emergence from the twilight of business depression into the splendid sunlight of prosperity. But, Mr. President, Mr. Harding was elected in November. A number of months have passed since the Republican victory—a victory so overwhelming that it amazed the Republicans, and I must confess that it stupefied the Democrats—but I have looked in vain to find the evidences of this prophesied prosperity that was to come like a majestic flood and sweep over the entire country. Republicans won the election two years ago and obtained control of this body, as also the House of Representatives. It was then said by the majority party, "We are going to have good times," and that prosperity would increase because of the Republican victory, but business refused to respond to Republican victory or Republican promises.

Mr. President, I do not want to be partisan. I want to say that the business and industrial conditions of the country have resulted, not because of Republican successes; they were absolutely inevitable. I would not be unfair enough to charge that the present economic conditions and the industrial disaster which have come to the American people are to be attributed to Republican success. The trouble is fundamentally not superficial and goes deeper than mere election results. But there are too many people who look to the Government as the fountain of prosperity or as the cause of adversity. We have been taught, unfortunately, by many of the false political prophets in our midst, that our prosperity depends upon the Government rather than upon the people themselves. There are too many false teachers in the land who insist that the power that gives us beneficent things rests with the Government, rather than with the people themselves.

Mr. President, the power for weal or for woe, politically or industrially, rests with the people, not with the Government. It is time that men and women in this Republic began to realize the fact that they are the arbiters of their own economic as well as their political destiny, and that there are tides surging throughout the world affecting the political and the economic conditions of humanity that are beyond the control of political organizations and beyond the omnipotent power of the most paternalistic of governments. There are certain laws that are operative in the economic world, and if we by legislation seek to nullify them we only add to our misfortune and contribute to our woes.

Mr. President, it is a profound discovery of the German philosophers that we find exemplified in sociological conditions, in the social organism, these principles of evolution and growth and progress and development which find expression in the biological world. There is universality of law, and its violation in the economic world is attended with serious consequences. The progress of the government depends upon the individual units within the government. A bold, courageous, industrious, enterprising people will compel success, and will bring prosperity, regardless of adverse conditions by which they may be surrounded. Prosperity is a plant that grows through the individualism and industry and thrift and courage and manhood and self-reliance of the people. There may be exotic growths, superficial in character, the product of unwise law, and legislation which flies in the face of the inexorable laws governing the world; but in the end the natural laws of progress will assert themselves, and the exotic plants will wither and die, and the hardy plants which have grown in the sunlight and in the shadow and in the storm of opposition and of rivalry will survive.

The letter which the Senator from Idaho read contained a statement which is pertinent. The writer said: "I do not know that Congress can do anything to relieve the situation." I know one thing that Congress can do. Congress can let the people alone. It can reduce taxes and limit appropriations.

Adam Smith refers to the conditions essential to progress and happiness. They call for light taxes and a "tolerable" degree of justice. If there were more independence, I mean personal independence, more self-reliance, a greater faith in local self-government, it would make for the welfare and advancement of the people.

The people want an opportunity to work out their own destiny, untrammelled and unhampered by the powerful and omnipotent hand of a paternalistic government. Mr. President, the Government of the United States unfortunately for a number of years has been drifting away from what I regard as sound political principles. It is adopting a policy which more and more develops a spirit of paternalism and more and more enervates and atrophies the individuals and the States.

The people come from every part of our land to Congress for relief, instead of appealing to and relying upon themselves, and if it is a matter for governmental interposition, to their own States, which have to do with their local and domestic affairs. The Federal Government has certain functions to perform. They are determined by the Constitution of the United States. This is a Government of enumerated powers, and the Federal Government may not project itself beyond the limits established by the Constitution of the United States.

But I say we are drifting from those conceptions which our fathers had, and which obtained for many years in this Republic, and the struggle now is for the individuals and for the States to maintain themselves against this rising, omnipotent tide of federalism which seeks their destruction.

So people come to Congress and ask for greater appropriations, and Congress, responding to the importunities of the people, increases the appropriations from year to year, until, as has been stated by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], the appropriations will be so great that we will have a deficit of from two to three billion dollars for the current year.

We are considering now the Naval appropriation bill. Saturday we passed the Army bill. I shall not trespass upon the time of the Senate to read the statistics showing the appropriations made in Great Britain, Germany, France, and other nations of Europe, and Japan, for their armies from 1912, indeed from earlier periods, down to the breaking out of the Great War. I have them here and they are very instructive. Mr. President, without turning to the page showing the appropriations made by Germany, my recollection is that we are appropriating for the coming year for the Army of the United States more than Germany ever appropriated for her army, except during the period of the great World War. We appropriated on Saturday more than \$400,000,000 for an Army of 175,000 men. Germany, the greatest military power of Europe, when she had

an army of some half a million to a million men, did not expend in a single year the amount which we appropriated for the next fiscal year for an Army of 175,000 men; and we are at peace and more than two years removed from the war.

Mr. President, whatever the Federal Government does it does in an extravagant, wasteful manner. It costs the Federal Government more than any civilized Government in the world to execute a given program, and it is wasteful, measured by the activities of private business. We have developed a spirit of extravagance and wastefulness upon the part of the Federal Government and its officials, so our expenses mount and increase in the War Department and in the Navy Department, and have attained heights never before reached, except during the period of war. The end of the war brings no relief from taxation and promises no economies.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] called attention to the expenditures made by our Government for naval purposes for a number of years last past, and showed that the appropriation asked for now, over \$500,000,000, was two or three times greater than it ever was prior to the breaking out of the war.

What is the reason for these tremendous expenses, Mr. President? Is it impossible for the Federal Government to function along business lines, along the paths of economy and efficiency? Shall we confess that democracy is a failure, and that we can not, in the administration of a democratic Government, practice those virtues of economy and efficiency which we must allege characterize autocratic governments? This much must be said for Germany, that notwithstanding she was a military power and was autocratic, and, indeed, in many respects despotic, she enforced economy and efficiency, and in the army and in the navy for every mark which was expended she got a corresponding benefit.

The item under consideration now, Mr. President, is increased, as I have stated, from that which is found in the bill as it passed the House. So it is with nearly every other item in the bill. If this were the only increase, it would not excite any particular attention. We turn to the very next item, on page 4, line 10, and find an increase there of half a million dollars. On the following page, page 5, as it passed the House, the bill carried \$440,000, under that particular paragraph, for aviation, and the Senate committee recommended an increase to \$1,440,000; and, indeed, on the following line the amount seems to be increased to \$6,125,750, showing an increase of more than five millions and a half above that which was carried in the bill as it passed the House.

In lines 18 and 19 the bill, as it passed the House, carried an appropriation of \$1,615,000 "for continuing experiments and development work on all types of aircraft." That has been increased to \$3,000,000.

On lines 20 and 22, the item for "new construction, buildings, and improvements at air stations at a total cost not to exceed \$1,339,000," seems to be an entirely new item. The aggregate increase there is the amount which I last mentioned.

On the following page the item of \$6,913,431 is increased, so that the Senate committee bill carries \$18,729,000.

On page 7 there seems to be a new item of \$2,500,000. When I say new, I mean an item that was not found in the bill as it passed the House.

On page 9, under the head of "Bureau of Navigation," the amount appropriated by the House was \$3,500,000. The Senate committee bill carries \$4,500,000.

On line 9 of the same page, there is an item of \$100,000 which is entirely new, no corresponding item being found in the bill as it passed the House.

Page 10 carries an amendment of \$100,000. I am not sure but what that, however, is the same amount carried by an item which was stricken out.

Page 11 increases the appropriation for miscellaneous items, under the head of "Instruments and Supplies," from \$750,000 to \$850,000.

Page 12 increases the amount, under the head of "Naval Training Station, California," from \$125,000 to \$150,000.

On line 23 there is an increase in the item from \$185,000 to \$300,000, under the head of "Naval Training Station, Rhode Island."

On page 13, under the head of "Naval Training Station, Great Lakes," the item has been increased from \$400,000 to \$500,000.

On pages 15 and 16, under the head of "Summer Schools for Boys," is a new item, \$200,000.

Under the head of "Naval Reserve Force Board," page 17, the item has been increased from \$50,000 to \$100,000, and under the head of "Receiving Barracks," lines 12 and 13, the item has been increased from \$50,000 to \$100,000.

On page 20, under the head of "Bureau of Ordnance," there has been an increase of \$1,000,000, so that the item stands \$15,000,000, as provided in the Senate committee bill.

On page 22, under the head of "Bureau of Yards and Docks," there is an increase of from \$7,500,000 to \$9,000,000.

On page 22, lines 23, 24, and 25, there are increases of \$140,000.

On page 23, Mr. President, there are two new items, \$1,150,000 and \$40,000, under the head of "Navy Yard, Charleston, S. C." On lines 15 and 16 is a new item, carrying \$800,000, for a naval station at Key West, Fla.

On page 24 there is an item of \$500,000, which is new, for Pier 4, 700-foot extension, and a corresponding increase in the aggregate amount carried in that paragraph.

On page 25 there is a new item of \$1,000,000, but there is a continuing appropriation, or, rather, obligation assumed by the appropriation, of \$1,975,000.

The next item, submarine base at New London, carries \$50,000, which is a new item.

On lines 23 to 25, on page 25, is a new item, \$1,499,000, for a submarine and destroyer base upon the island of Guam.

On page 26 is an item to continue the development of a permanent training station, \$1,000,000.

The House appropriated \$1,000,000 to complete it, but evidently the Senate committee felt that the amount allowed by the House for the completion was inadequate, and they are appropriating \$1,000,000 to continue development. Apparently there is no limitation upon the amount which may be expended in the prosecution of that work.

In lines 4, 5, 6, and 7 on the same page is carried an appropriation of \$800,000 for a new naval air station at Sand Point, Wash. That is a new item not carried in the bill as it passed the House.

It is worthy of comment at this point that there seems to be a determination upon the part of the Navy Department to diffuse rather than to concentrate, and to increase the number of naval bases, aviation fields, submarine bases, and various plants and agencies of the Government. It would be economy if we would concentrate our naval activities, our construction plants, our naval bases. I think it was Admiral Sims who testified in one of the hearings that it would be better if there were fewer naval bases and naval plants, arsenals, and yards. We have a large establishment at Portsmouth, N. H., a still larger one at Boston, a large navy yard at Brooklyn, a great establishment at Philadelphia, a large plant at Norfolk. We have expended a large sum of money at Charleston, S. C. Various amounts have been appropriated for ports along the coast of Florida. The pending bill, in addition to appropriations for these particular points, carries great appropriations for additional bases and plants and establishments, not only upon the Atlantic but upon the Pacific coast.

There is one item which occurs to me at this point, and which will provoke some discussion, I fancy, before we get through with it, providing more than a million dollars to begin the construction of a plant at Alameda, Calif. The Government of the United States has expended about \$32,000,000 at Mare Island, and has developed, perhaps, the most efficient naval construction plant in the world.

The record which the Mare Island plant had during the war was unequalled in this country or in any other country. Notwithstanding the appropriation of \$32,000,000 for that plant in San Francisco Bay, there is a project now which, before it is completed, will cost at least \$100,000,000 for a plant in the same bay. Of course, it means the ultimate scrapping of Mare Island and the loss of the \$32,000,000 which has been expended there. I know Senators will say that we will continue the Mare Island plant, and that we will build a large naval base at Alameda. The time will come when the overhead of two bases or plants will not be maintained. One or the other plant, if we construct the one at Alameda, will be dismantled, and, of course, it will be the one which will perhaps cost the lesser amount. So the appropriations made for Mare Island will be lost, and the pending bill commits us to a policy of expending \$100,000,000 more in San Francisco Bay.

I have here reports and data which I shall read if the chairman of the committee insists upon that item, and which will take several hours to present. It is a great mistake, in my opinion, now to make an appropriation of a single dollar for the Alameda base. Of course, the bill does not come out boldly, as it ought to do, and declare for an ultimate appropriation of what the proposed base will cost, namely, \$100,000,000; but there is in the bill an insinuating item of only a million five hundred dollars; but when we appropriate this amount, then we have permitted the camel to put its nose into the tent, and it

will not be content until it takes possession of the tent. In the next session of Congress we will be called upon to appropriate \$10,000,000 or more, and at the next session \$20,000,000, and so on, until \$100,000,000 will be expended. In my opinion this project should not be undertaken. It is a mistake, and we should refuse to agree to the committee's amendment.

Mr. HALE rose.

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. The question of the appropriation for Alameda will come before the Senate in due order, and the same is true of the other matters to which the Senator has referred. The particular amendment before the Senate at the present time—

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator to ask a question if he desires. The Senator can not enlighten me as to the item which is before us.

Mr. HALE. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the particular item is on page 3 of the bill, \$400,000 for telephone rental and tolls, telegrams, and cablegrams. The committee would be very glad to answer any questions on the other matters as they come up in the due course of the consideration of the bill.

Mr. KING. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Maine for suggesting that the committee will be glad to answer questions as they arise during the course of the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HALE. The chairman of the subcommittee who has charge of the bill is at present away from the floor of the Senate, and in his absence I shall be glad to answer any questions that I can.

Mr. KING. I have no doubt the Senator from Maine, who is one of the most valuable members upon the Committee on Naval Affairs, can furnish a great deal of information to myself as well as to other Senators upon the naval affairs of the Government and upon the modus operandi of the Navy Department and upon the method by which the estimates are obtained. I have no doubt the Senator can furnish us a great deal of information, and I can assure my distinguished friend that he will be called upon to furnish a great deal before the bill gets through the Senate. I can assure him further that unless the information is satisfactory the bill will not get through the Senate during this session of Congress.

I was commenting very briefly, because I shall consider the Alameda item a little later when in due course we reach it, upon the proposition involved in the Alameda proposal. It is merely illustrative of the method of the Government in the way in which it does business. It is illustrative of the devious ways, I may say, of the Army and the Navy in securing appropriations, the extravagant methods employed in the Army and in the Navy of the United States. As has been suggested by the distinguished Senator at my right [Mr. OWEN], they do not pay the bills, and they do not care how the bills are paid. For every dollar that we take out of the United States Treasury we have to send a taxgatherer to the homes of the people of the United States. The money that comes from the Treasury to meet these extravagant demands of officials of the Government comes from the sweat and the toil of labor and from the earnings and savings of the people.

Money does not flow into the Treasury from the sunbeams or the smiles of Federal officials. It is obtained as a result of the enactment of burdensome laws, enforced by the strong arm of Federal officials and, if necessary, by the gun and the bayonet of the military of the United States. The American people seem to forget where the money comes from that we appropriate out of the Treasury of the United States. I received a letter only yesterday, which I read this morning, calling upon the Government of the United States to appropriate at once \$500,000,000 for the purpose of impounding the waters of some of the streams and rivers of the United States for use in reclaiming arid and semiarid lands. The gentleman who wrote the letter did not seem to appreciate the fact that before we could get \$500,000,000 we would have to increase the taxes, and he, in common with other Americans, would be compelled to pay his share of that amount.

We have been so indiscriminate in our appropriations, so lavish, so prodigal, and so wasteful that many of the American people have become so voracious and demand still more and rely upon the Government to appropriate for local and State concerns. If we appropriate \$1,000,000,000, they want \$2,000,000,000. If we appropriate \$2,000,000,000, they demand \$3,000,000,000. And all the time the Liberty bonds go down and the taxes are increased and the burdens resting upon business are intensified until difficulty is experienced in meeting the exactions of the Government and economic conditions which threaten paralysis to our industrial life.

I have said that the item of \$1,250,000 for Alameda is one of the illustrations of the method by which the Federal Govern-

ment is induced to make lavish appropriations in the end. A small amount is asked. It seems unimportant, and the Government is committed to a policy which in the end calls for millions and tens of millions of dollars. It is claimed that this Government is the most extravagant Government on the face of the earth to-day; that the expenses of the Federal Government exceed the expenses of any other Government, notwithstanding the dual form of our Government and the fact that States are expending hundreds of millions annually for the maintenance of the State governments.

And all these Federal, State, county, and municipal burdens rest upon the people and are increasing at a ratio entirely disproportionate to the increase in wealth and population of the country.

I shall not at this time further examine these items, but I venture the assertion, Mr. President, that at least 90 per cent of the items have been increased by the Senate committee. The House bill carried an aggregate of \$400,000,000; the Senate committee has increased the amount by \$105,000,000; and this, Mr. President, at a time when we are at peace with the world; when we are not menaced by a single foe; when we have no foreign entanglements and no foreign relations that are provocative of war.

It has been said during the debate this afternoon, in a colloquy with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], as I understood the situation, that if we should build the most powerful Navy in the world it would enable us more effectually to negotiate for disarmament. I deny the premises, Mr. President. I believe the argument is fallacious. I believe when we aver that we shall have the biggest Navy in the world now, at the conclusion of the World War, and at the same time profess a desire for peace, that the nations of the world may view with suspicion and skepticism the professions in which we indulge. If we want to impress the nations of the earth with the thought that we desire peace let us set an example of peace; if we want the nations to emulate us, let us set an example that is worthy of emulation. The braggart, the thug, the armed man on the streets brandishing his weapons and breathing out threats against his fellows may not impress those with whom he comes in contact with the idea that he is a lover of peace, no matter how eloquently he may affirm that he is.

Mr. President, it is not sacrilegious upon this occasion to refer to the noble beatitudes by which we should be inspired. We want to be peacemakers, and it is the peacemakers who are "blessed" and "shall be called the children of God," and the meek who "shall inherit the earth." This Nation stands upon the glittering heights of the New World. Its example should illumine the world. In the darkness and in the light the radiance of this Nation gleams out upon the tempestuous seas for the guidance of those nations which are tossed upon the billows and the stormy seas of national existence. If this Nation desires other nations to pursue the paths of peace, let the American Nation set an example for peace; if it wants disarmament, let it set the example that will press an eloquent plea for disarmament; if it desires the day to come when men shall not learn the arts of war and when the lion and the lamb shall lie down together, let this great Nation that fears no nation or all nations set an example. It will thus become potential in moving forward the standard of justice and righteousness and will lead all nations into the paths of amity and peace.

Mr. STERLING and Mr. OWEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Utah has concluded?

Mr. KING. Oh, no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair begs pardon of the Senator.

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota, if he desires.

REPEAL OF WAR LEGISLATION.

Mr. STERLING. I wish to ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed with the further consideration of House joint resolution 382, being No. 662 on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Utah yield for that purpose?

Mr. KING. I am very happy to yield to my friend from South Dakota.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HALE. Can the Senator from South Dakota inform us how long it will take to dispose of the joint resolution for which he asks consideration?

Mr. STERLING. I think it will take a very short time, I will say to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think there ought to be more Senators here, though I do not know that I have any objection—

Mr. STERLING. I know of no Senator who is opposed to the joint resolution, and I hope that the Senator will not call for a quorum. I may say to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] that I have conferred with Senators who made some question about this joint resolution when it was previously before the Senate on Saturday last.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not desire to make any opposition to the joint resolution, but I merely think there should be more Senators present.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The responsibility, of course, for passing the supply bills rests with the majority party, and if Senators on the other side of the Chamber desire to lay aside a supply bill to take up the joint resolution in charge of the Senator from South Dakota, I shall not object. I am heartily in favor of the repeal of the war-time legislation, but I think the important bills that should be disposed of now are the supply bills which have got to go to conference. However, I am not in charge of the legislation, and neither is this side of the House responsible for the passage of the supply bills.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Alabama realizes that the joint resolution to repeal the war legislation is an important measure.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Undoubtedly; but it is legislation which may be passed without going to conference.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I think what the Senator from Alabama says—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. KING. I yield for a question.

Mr. HALE. I think what the Senator from Alabama says is entirely right; that the appropriation bill ought to have the right of way. If, however, the Senator from South Dakota can assure the Senate that it will not take over half an hour to dispose of the joint resolution which he has in charge, I should be entirely willing to yield for that purpose.

Mr. STERLING. I should not like to give an absolute assurance that it would not take more than half an hour, but I think it will take less time than that.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator agree at the expiration of a half hour's time to return to the consideration of the naval appropriation bill now pending, provided he can not by that time secure action on the joint resolution?

Mr. STERLING. Yes; I will agree to that.

Mr. HALE. Very well.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, there were Senators on the floor when the joint resolution was under consideration on Saturday who objected to it. I do not see them on the floor at the present time and I do not know what their feelings now are in regard to the matter; but I do not think that action should be taken in their absence, if they are opposed to it. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] was the Senator who made objection when the joint resolution went over on Saturday. The Senator from Colorado told me this morning, however, that he had no further objection to the measure.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understood the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] also had some objection.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator from Arkansas also told me the day when the joint resolution was last under consideration, after the discussion which then occurred, that he had no further objection to it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have, I repeat, no objection to the joint resolution being considered if those Senators are satisfied—and the Senator assures me they are—but I did not want advantage taken of them in their absence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection made to the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, was there a limitation on the time to be devoted to the consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. HALE. Half an hour.

Mr. STERLING. Half an hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request being amended to include a limitation of half an hour?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have no objection to the limitation, but a number of Senators are not here who are

interested in the measure, and if there is to be a limitation of time on its consideration I will be compelled to ask for a quorum in order that the absent Senators may have an opportunity to be heard. If they come in here and there is no objection, I will raise none; but I am not willing at this time of night to have a joint resolution of this importance brought up and have a limitation as to time placed on its consideration. As a matter of fact, I do not think under the rules the Senator can make such an agreement without a quorum being called.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll. The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gooding	McKellar	Smoot
Ball	Gronna	Moses	Spencer
Borah	Hale	New	Stanley
Brandegee	Heflin	Norris	Sterling
Calder	Hitchcock	Overman	Sutherland
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Townsend
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Trammell
Dial	Kenyon	Poindexter	Underwood
Dillingham	Keyes	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Elkins	King	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Kirby	Sheppard	Warren
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Simmons	Willis
Gerry	Lenroot	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Glass	McCumber	Smith, S. C.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 14157, an act to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War; to provide revenue therefor; and for other purposes.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, a point of order. Unanimous consent has been given, as I understand, for the consideration of this House joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Secretaries at the desk that while unanimous consent was asked it was not given, as a matter of record.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the question that is pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota asked unanimous consent to lay aside the unfinished business for half an hour, and the Chair was about to put that question when the absence of a quorum was suggested.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Will the Senator from South Dakota state the purpose of his request for unanimous consent?

Mr. STERLING. The purpose is the consideration of House joint resolution 382, being the joint resolution which, in effect, repeals war-time legislation.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I will withhold my motion until the Senator from South Dakota has preferred his request.

Mr. STERLING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Has unanimous consent been granted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; not yet. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand that the request is that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for one-half hour for the purpose of taking up the measure referred to by the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And not to displace the unfinished business except for a half hour. That is the understanding of the Chair. Is there objection? There being none, it is so ordered.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 382) declaring that certain acts of Congress, joint resolutions, and proclamations shall be construed as if the war had ended and the present or existing emergency expired.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, the joint resolution has been read. I wish to offer the following amendment:

On lines 15 and 16, on page 3 of the joint resolution, strike out the words "between the Governments and people aforesaid" and insert the same language after the word "war," in line 18, so that it shall read:

During the existence of a state of war or during such state of war and a limited period of time thereafter shall be construed and administered as if such war between the Governments and people aforesaid terminated on the date when this resolution becomes effective.

I also desire to offer one other amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Dakota kindly suspend at this point until the first amendment is disposed of, unless he wishes to present them as a whole—as one amendment?

Mr. STERLING. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I suggest that the bill be read and the amendment indicated to the particular clause to be amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 3, lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to strike out the words "between the Governments and people aforesaid" and to insert the same words after the word "war," in line 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STERLING. The second amendment I propose is as follows:

On page 4, lines 1 and 2, strike out the words "the amendment thereto" and insert in lieu thereof the words and numerals "Title 2 of the act," so that it will read:

Title 2 of the act entitled "The food control and District of Columbia rents act."

The effect of this will be to leave excepted from the provisions of this joint resolution the food control act, but not to leave excepted from the provisions of the joint resolution section 4 of the food control act, which was amended by a later act of Congress, and which, as I am informed, was to-day declared unconstitutional in the decision of the Supreme Court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 4, lines 1 and 2, it is proposed to strike out the words "the amendment thereto" and insert "Title 2 of the act," so that if amended it will read:

(40 Stats., p. 276). Title 2 of the act entitled "The food control and District of Columbia rents act."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator advise us now what effect that has on the so-called Lever Act?

Mr. STERLING. The Lever Act will be excepted from the provisions of this joint resolution, which, in effect, of course, repeals the war-time legislation. It excepts the Lever Act, the food-control act, with the exception, of course, of the amendment to section 4 of the act, which was passed, as the Senator will recall, in connection with the rent commission act.

Mr. BORAH. It leaves the Lever Act the law of the land, except that part which the Supreme Court to-day said was unconstitutional?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. That was the criminal feature of the act; was it not?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. The unfortunate part is that the court did not hold it all unconstitutional.

Mr. STERLING. Section 4 of the original act would stand, I suppose.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I think the Senator from South Dakota ought to give to the Senate some reasons why the food control act should be continued, if there are any. I confess that at the present time I do not know why it should not be repealed.

Let me remark in this connection that this joint resolution repeals a whole lot of legislation most of which is entirely inoperative now. Much ado has been made about the delay in repealing this legislation, and perhaps it ought to have been repealed a long time ago; but those features of the war legislation which really have any virility whatever to them yet remain unrepealed by the measure that is before us. I have not been able to understand why the food control act should not be entirely repealed. Something was said about the necessity of keeping it in force in order to control the coal profiteers; but we have not been able to utilize it to any appreciable extent to correct evils of that character, if the report of the committee investigating that subject is to be relied upon.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not familiar with this joint resolution. I am not on the committee, nor have I read the decision of to-day of the Supreme Court; but my understanding is that the Supreme Court of the United States to-day held that the penalty clauses of the food control act, the so-called Lever Act, were unconstitutional. Does that leave any vitality at all to the Lever Act?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Practically none.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Is there any reason, then, why we should continue to keep it on the statute books?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That, I am able to say to the Senator, was the consideration which induced the committee, after such consideration as it gave it, to except it from the operation of this repealing measure, namely, that it might be available for the purpose of punishing profiteers, and particularly profiteers in coal; but if the effect of the decision ren-

dered to-day is as the Senator from Alabama understands it to be, that is an additional reason why the whole thing should go.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what effect this has upon the Alien Property Custodian trust?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The alien property act is retained in force, that being one of the acts which still has some function to perform, and we do not undertake to repeal that. The fact is that the repealing act of which so much has been heard repeals only the things that are innocuous now; and therefore I am a little surprised that the Senate should take up any time, when time is so precious, to consider the measure.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I think it quite proper, if not urgent, that these various acts passed as war-time legislation, and the effect of which, anyhow, should be terminated at the end of the war, should be formerly repealed or construed, anyhow, the construction being in effect a repeal of these acts. That is what the House joint resolution provides, and there is an insistent demand that they be repealed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. KING. I suggest to the Senator for his consideration—and I ask the Senator from Montana to give me his attention while I make this observation—that there have been a number of convictions under a provision of the act in regard to hoarding. I am inclined to think that those convictions would be quite compatible with the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, and it seems to me that those cases would stand upon an entirely different footing from those that were brought under section 4, and it might not be proper to repeal this act, because I know a number of convictions are pending now, either in the Circuit Court of Appeals or in the Supreme Court of the United States. There was no question about the offense of hoarding as defined by the statute. Now, do we want to repeal this law and leave those convictions to go by the board?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. My understanding is that the bill expressly preserves the right to prosecute offenses already committed.

Mr. KING. If that be true, then the point I suggested has no merit.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I inquire of the Senator from South Dakota whether my understanding is not correct?

Mr. STERLING. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. My recollection is that there is a provision in this joint resolution to the effect that offenses heretofore committed in violation of the acts repealed may be prosecuted as though they were in force.

Mr. STERLING. I will say to the Senator from Montana that I do not think there is any such distinct provision in the joint resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. STERLING. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. As I understand the decision of the Supreme Court, it does not reach all of the provisions of the Lever Act. It only reaches that provision which undertakes to make a crime out of charging unreasonable profits, the court holding that the term "unreasonable profits" is so uncertain that it does not put a defendant upon notice of what would or would not be a crime, and that therefore an indictment for making an unreasonable profit could not be sustained. What was an unreasonable profit the act did not say, and the defendant would not know, when he was making a charge, whether the profit was or was not unreasonable. In that particular case parties sold sugar at 20 cents a pound which had been bought at 12 cents a pound, when at the time they could not buy sugar on the market at 22 cents a pound. The court held that that provision in the act was unconstitutional, but the balance of the Lever Act was left in force, both that provision which applied to coal and that which applied to hoarding.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator from Georgia is correct in his interpretation of the opinion of the Supreme Court, as I understand it, which was that the act was unconstitutional because of uncertainty and vagueness in section 4 of the food control act as amended.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from South Dakota what effect this joint resolution will have, if it becomes a law, on the act familiarly known as the Overman Act?

Mr. STERLING. It will make it ineffective. The effect of the joint resolution is to repeal the Overman Act.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Doubtless that act should be repealed; but, as I recall the act, it provided that after the lapse of a certain

length of time, upon the termination of the war, the changes that had been made by authority of the act, in the way of transferring one office over to another or the duties of one office to another should no longer prevail, and the departmental situation should revert to what it was before the passage of the act.

Mr. OVERMAN. Six months was the time fixed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Six months, I recall, was the time. I would like to make this suggestion for the Senator's consideration: If there were any transfers of authority from one office to another or the abolishment of any particular office or bureau under the authority of that act, it might require a little time for the civil establishment to reform itself in that particular. Therefore, would it be wise summarily to repeal that act and allow no lapse of a little time for the retransfer of functions to take place? It might create confusion.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The six months provided in the Overman Act will run from the passage of this joint resolution.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I think the Senator is in error.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Oh, yes; clearly that is the case. The Overman Act provided six months' time for the restoration of the departments, or the assignments, to their prior legal status, after the termination of the war. The joint resolution simply fixes the termination of the war with the passage of this act, and the six months provided by the Overman Act will run from the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I ask the Senator from Georgia how he construes the language of the joint resolution which I shall read? I may say I have never read the measure before, and I am asking for information. It reads:

And any act of Congress or any provision of any such act that by its terms is in force only during the existence of a state of war between the Governments and people aforesaid, or during such state of war and a limited period of time thereafter, shall be construed and administered as if such war terminated on the date when this resolution becomes effective, any provision of such law to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Precisely.

Mr. WOLCOTT. What is the idea of the insertion of the clause "and a limited period of time thereafter"?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It means that the termination of the war shall be construed as taking place now, and "a limited period of time thereafter" shall apply still, just as though the act had not been passed; that the time for the enforcement of the acts shall continue, as contained in the acts, the same length of time after the passage of this act which it would have continued had the war been terminated by a proclamation of the President. That is what we meant by it in the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If that be the intent, it seems to me it is rather inadequately expressed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think we are all embarrassed by the fact that we have not had an opportunity to read the text of the opinion of the Supreme Court rendered to-day. I was in attendance on the court, but was obliged to leave just before that opinion was rendered. But a very good lawyer who was present told me that the opinion was very sweeping, and that in his opinion it destroyed all those features of the Lever Act which had to do with the punishment of citizens for selling goods at unreasonable profits, and similar clauses, the main ground of the opinion being that the statute was utterly vague, and that it gave neither the defendant, the court, nor the jury the opportunity to know really what a man was being tried for.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator from Missouri admits, I suppose, that that simply relates to section 4, as amended by the act of October 22, 1919?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I can give the Senator some information in regard to that. I am familiar with the case that was primarily under consideration. It was an indictment against a wholesale firm for selling sugar at an unreasonable profit, at 20 cents a pound, when they paid 12 cents a pound, and it fell under section 4 of the act. I was told by one of the justices that the effect of the decision was to hold the language "an unreasonable profit" to be so indefinite that it did not place the public upon notice as to what would be a crime.

Mr. REED. I think that is correct, and I think the Senator in charge of the joint resolution is correct when he says that the particular case was based upon section 4.

I speak with great embarrassment, because I have not read the opinion, but if I am accurately informed with reference to it, the reasoning would seem to me to apply to many other features of the measure. I think it is worth taking a moment to try to get the situation with reference to it fairly before the

Senate. [After a pause.] However, I have just been informed that under a unanimous-consent agreement the joint resolution will be voted upon in seven minutes. Is that correct?

Mr. STERLING. That is about right, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Then I will try to say what I have to say in a very short space of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are still 10 minutes left.

Mr. REED. The joint resolution now pending before us, as I understand, leaves intact the Lever Act, except section 4.

Mr. STERLING. Except section 4.

Mr. REED. The Lever Act with section 4 out still contains some of the most drastic of the war powers which were granted. Under it the coal mines of the country can be seized. Under it the President can declare emergencies and fix the price of coal. Under it certain businesses can be compelled to take out licenses, I notice as I glance over it hurriedly. Under it a man can be punished for being guilty of what they call hoarding, and I do not think there is a farmer in the United States who has been able to hold his wheat, or his cotton, who has not been guilty of a crime under that act, for he has been holding it for the purpose of increasing the price. Indeed that is one of the property rights which an American citizen has at any time, except in time of war; and no one would think of denying it to him.

I think the whole Lever Act was badly conceived, and that it ought to be taken off the statute books of this country. It was enacted as a war measure. I opposed it then because of its extreme provision, but other Senators voted for it because we had war times and they thought it was necessary to do anything and everything to put power in the hands of the Government so that the Government could act in a manner they regarded as more effective than it could follow under the law as it stood.

I ask the Senator from South Dakota to submit the question so that we can have a vote on striking out the Lever Act and its amendments, and if we can have that vote I shall not take any time in discussing it.

Mr. STERLING. Any Senator, I suppose, can move an amendment to strike out the provision that retains the Lever Act. I do not feel like doing it.

Mr. REED. I have not the joint resolution before me. Will the Senator call attention to that language, and I will move to strike it out?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Here is a copy of the joint resolution.

Mr. STERLING. Beginning on line 22, on page 3, it extends over to a part of line 1 on page 4.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I have given some consideration to this, I will say to the Senator from Missouri, and I concur with him in his view about the matter. His object will be accomplished by striking out so much of the amendment on pages 3 and 4 as begins with the word "the," in line 22, down to and including the numerals "297," in line 4 on page 4, namely:

The act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved August 10, 1917 (40 Stat., p. 276), the amendment thereto entitled "The food control and District of Columbia rents act," approved October 22, 1919 (41 Stat., p. 297).

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I submit to the Senator from Montana that all that should not be stricken out, if we intend to retain the rent commission act. It has already been amended so as to include Title 2 of the act entitled "The food control and District of Columbia rents act." That strikes out the important part of the amendatory food control act.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I had that idea myself, Mr. President, and was going to conclude with the numerals "276," in line 1, on page 4, and then make a slight amendment in the language which followed it. But I had before me the so-called food control and District of Columbia rent act, approved October 22, 1919, and there is not a word in the joint resolution as to rents in the District of Columbia.

Mr. STERLING. If the Senator will read Title 2 of that act, he will find that all that title relates to that section.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Then the Senator wants to retain Title 2.

Mr. STERLING. Yes. If the Senator from Montana will excuse me, the Senator from Missouri would accomplish his purpose, I think, if he provides by his amendment that the language beginning on line 22, of page 3, after the words "to wit," and extending down to the figures "276," in line 1, on page 4, be stricken out, because an amendment has already pre-

vailed which retains Title 2 of the act entitled "The food control and District of Columbia rents act." Title 2 relates to the rent commission.

Mr. REED. I was obliged, coming in as I did, to get my information in this way, and I am obliged to Senators who have been following the bill for their courtesy. I now move to amend by striking out the following language on pages 3 and 4:

The act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products, and fuel," approved August 10, 1917 (40 Stat., p. 276).

I make that motion, but I wish also to make an inquiry. How does that cover the act of October 22, 1919?

Mr. STERLING. It covers it in this way, that no part of that act is retained under the provision of the joint resolution except Title 2.

Mr. REED. It is covered otherwise in the joint resolution?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. REED. I move the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has moved the following amendment, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The READING CLERK. On page 3, beginning at line 22, the Senator from Missouri moves to strike out the following language:

The act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products, and fuel," approved August 10, 1917 (40 Stat., p. 276).

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is still as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Senator from North Dakota if it were not really intended to preserve the pending prosecutions under the act?

Mr. STERLING. I think so.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Then I offer for that purpose the amendment to the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana proposes the following amendment to the amendment, which will be read:

The READING CLERK. Insert at the end of the bill the following:

Nothing herein contained shall be held to exempt from prosecution or to relieve from punishment any offense heretofore committed in violation of any act hereby repealed or which may be committed while it remains in force as herein provided.

Mr. STERLING. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

Mr. STERLING. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives upon the joint resolution and amendment and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. STERLING, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. OVERMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

LOANS ON AGRICULTURAL PAPER.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have consulted with a number of Senators. We are all aware of the fact that the most distressing condition exists amongst the farmers of the country. We are about to adjourn and it seems to me that it is the duty of the Congress to bend every effort to take care, as far as it can be done legally, of the basic industry of the country which is now in perhaps the worst condition it has been in in the history of the country. We have under our control now the financial system of the country as we never have had it before. It is more amenable to the direct indications of Congress than ever before. I ask unanimous consent that there may be considered, while the pending bill is temporarily laid aside, without reference to the committee, a joint resolution which I am quite sure every Member of the Senate is willing to accord to those in distress. We are about to vote \$10,000,000 to protect the country from a foreign foe, and this is simply extending aid to those who must support the country, no matter whether we have a foe or not.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not ask the Senator to yield. I understood that he was asking unanimous consent.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. All I am doing is this: I ask to have the joint resolution read, and then if there is objection I shall ask to have it referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I hope, however, that a reference will not be necessary, because the time is very short, to see if we can get a report and then have it considered later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to having the joint resolution read at this time?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is a brief resolution. While I shall have to object to its consideration, I have no objection to having it read.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I did not understand the Senator's proposition.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have no objection to having the joint resolution read.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If it leads to any discussion, I shall ask that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is another question. If the Senator desires to have it read, I shall not object to that, but I am compelled to object to its consideration. I am familiar with the joint resolution.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the joint resolution can be taken up by unanimous consent and it leads to no discussion, would not the Senator be willing to have it passed? It will take only a minute if there is no objection.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think the mere reading of it, if the Senator will allow the joint resolution to be read, will disclose at once the fact that it will lead to discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 264) to authorize renewal of loans on agricultural paper was read the first time at length, as follows:

Whereas the present market conditions for farm products are entailing such losses as to threaten disaster to all those engaged in farming; and

Whereas the present demoralized state of this country, with certain foreign nations, is such as to promise little relief in the immediate future: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Federal Reserve Board is hereby authorized and directed to allow and encourage member banks to renew loans secured by safe agricultural paper for such a length of time as in the judgment of the board may be necessary to enable farmers to tide over the present demoralized and disastrous condition of the markets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. MOSES. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I desire to state to the Senate that perhaps there will be a time when we will discuss the measure. Of course, it may not pass, but I rather suspect we will have a discussion of it.

Mr. HEFLIN. I would suggest to the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. If the Senator from New Mexico will permit, we can discuss it now quite at length. I should like to discuss it for an hour and a half or two hours. If the Senator from Washington thinks he will save time, we can proceed to a discussion of it now.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am quite sure that unless it is passed it will take a day or a day and a half to discuss it. I rather think it will take that long. If the Senator from New Mexico will allow me, it is a joint resolution simply calling attention of the Federal Reserve Board to the fact that the purpose of the Congress was, as far as possible, to extend aid to that defenseless part of our industrial world which is not able to defend itself like other organizations and productive units of the Government.

Mr. NORRIS and Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that in substance—and I think in effect—the joint resolution which he introduces is the same as the joint resolution that was once reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

ture and Forestry at this session of Congress and passed by the Senate, and that went out in conference. Am I correct about that?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No.

Mr. NORRIS. It was connected up with a joint resolution reviving the War Finance Corporation.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The difference between the resolution to which the Senator refers and the joint resolution which I have just introduced is that the resolution to which he refers was incorporated in section 2 of the measure rehabilitating the War Finance Corporation.

Mr. GLASS. It did not go out in conference, but the House Committee on Banking and Currency eliminated it and reported the joint resolution to the House.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It provided a limitation upon the interest to be charged.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that is true.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The joint resolution which I have just introduced simply provides for a renewal of loans on safe agricultural paper.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, it is not a copy of the previous provision, and I do not contend that, but I think it would have the same effect that we intended the former resolution should have. After considerable debate in the Senate it was passed, but the House struck it out, and we concurred in the House amendment.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think perhaps it went out in the House. I do not remember that it reached conference. However, it went out. If the Senator will permit me, I think every Senator is aware of the fact that something of this kind should be done in order to encourage those who are suffering to-day from a condition that has not been paralleled in the country.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think the Senator understands the object I had in view, which was favorable to his joint resolution. On the ground that the Senate had already passed it, it did not seem to me it was necessary for it to go to the committee which had passed on it before.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MOSES. I wish to inquire the status of the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MOSES. It should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency inasmuch as it is a banking question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has twice asked that the joint resolution be referred, but before the Chair could take such action other Senators rose and were recognized. Without objection it will be referred—

Mr. POMERENE. Just one moment, please.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. MOSES. I move that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency rather than to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield for that purpose?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not believe, Mr. President, that I will yield for that purpose. It seems to me that the joint resolution presented by the Senator from South Carolina ought to be referred to the Committee on Agriculture, as I understand it has been so referred; and I do not believe I will yield for a motion to refer to another committee.

Mr. POMERENE, Mr. CALDER, and Mr. MOSES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Presiding Officer when the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Begging the Senator's pardon, the Chair will state that the Senator from South Carolina asked that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture, but before the Chair could make the statement that it was so referred another Senator secured recognition, and the joint resolution has not been referred.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. MOSES. I have moved that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that that motion is in order.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It is evident—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I decline to yield further.

Mr. MOSES. Then I rise to a point of order. I wish to know what has become of my motion?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I may say that the joint resolution presented by the Senator from South Carolina was presented out of order when another matter was before the Senate, and we have reached the present parliamentary stage.

Evidently it is going to provoke considerable discussion to dispose of the matters which Senators have in mind. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] has moved that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. That will undoubtedly cause debate. I had obtained the floor for the purpose of making a motion which I deem to be of more importance than whether the joint resolution of the Senator from South Carolina shall be referred to the Committee on Agriculture or whether it shall go to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MOSES. My point of order is that the joint resolution of the Senator from South Carolina has not been properly introduced, and, therefore, is not before the Senate at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that unanimous consent was granted for the reading of the resolution.

Mr. MOSES. But only for information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution was introduced, but it has not been referred. The motion of the Senator from New Hampshire is in order; he can move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency. That will be the pending motion, but the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] has the floor.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I make the point of order against the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire. I do not think that the consideration of that question is in order pending the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is some force in the point of order, but it does not now apply, because the Senator can not move the reference of the resolution while the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] has the floor. The motion of the Senator from New Hampshire will be in order when he secures the floor.

Mr. MOSES. Then, where is the joint resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint solution is now on the table.

Mr. MOSES. I am content that the joint resolution shall stay there.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I rise to a question of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut will state his question of order?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The joint resolution of the Senator from South Carolina was not introduced in the Senate in the way the rule provides that it shall be introduced, and hence is not subject to being referred. The Senator from South Carolina rose in his place and asked unanimous consent to have a document read here. It was read for the purpose of information, as the Senator from New Hampshire has stated; it was not introduced. Objection was made to its consideration and to the granting of the unanimous consent requested by the Senator from South Carolina. The joint resolution has not been introduced, and, therefore, can not be referred.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, when objection was made by the Senator from Washington to the present consideration of the joint resolution I stated that I would ask if it was not considered that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator from Washington said he would object to the present consideration of the resolution, but he did not object to the reading of it. Then I asked that the joint resolution be read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and I heard no objection to that request.

Mr. MOSES. Oh, Mr. President, I objected.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The joint resolution has been read, and the only question is the question of reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will, without any discourtesy, settle the question by simply holding that the resolution has been introduced; it is on the table; and the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] to refer to the Committee on Banking and Currency is the pending question. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] has the floor.

Mr. REED and Mr. BORAH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I wish to ask the author of the joint resolution what he means by this language:

Whereas the present demoralized state of this country with certain foreign nations is such as to promise little relief in the immediate future.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. What I mean by the words "little relief" is little relief to the farmers of the country. That is what I had in view.

Mr. REED. I inquire about the clause which refers to "the present demoralized state of this country with certain foreign nations."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I had in mind the status in which we find ourselves with certain foreign nations. We are still technically at war with Germany; our markets are absolutely demoralized by that; and so I referred to the present demoralized condition in which we find ourselves in relation to foreign countries.

Mr. REED. I am obliged to the Senator. I think I understand what he has in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor, but if he yields again he will lose the floor.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have no objection to disposing of the pending matter which has been discussed at some length, provided I shall not lose the floor. I rose for the purpose of making a motion; then, on yielding in a courteous manner to a Senator, to have all this complication to arise is entirely beside what I thought I was bringing on myself. I decline to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for the purpose of making a motion that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. So I am compelled to make a parliamentary inquiry. Is a motion now in order to proceed to the consideration of House bill 14157?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Do I understand the Senator to have made a motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That was the purpose for which I rose; and I now make a parliamentary inquiry, whether or not that motion is in order? If it is in order, I desire to make the motion.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to be heard for a moment on that question.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If the motion is in order, I desire to make some remarks upon it myself before yielding the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's motion is in order.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to be heard before the Chair rules on that. I understand it is the so-called bonus bill to which the Senator from New Mexico refers?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator is quite right.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Under Rule XXVI of the Senate, and also under Rule XXII, the motion is not in order. The bonus bill is here upon the report of a committee. Rule XXVI provides that reports of committees must lie over one day and be printed in order that the Senate may be informed. I will ask the attention of the Chair to the second paragraph of Rule XXVI, which provides:

All reports of committees and motions to discharge a committee from the consideration of the subject, and all subjects from which a committee shall be discharged, shall lie over one day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

This report was made to-day; I am informed that a member of the committee has given notice that he will submit a minority report; and, in order that the Senate may be informed as to the nature of the report, I invoke Rule XXVI, and make the point of order against the consideration of the motion at the present time. Also my own opinion is—I do not know that the question has heretofore been raised—that while a question is pending as it is now in the Senate upon an amendment of the committee to the naval appropriation bill, under Rule XXII the motion is not in order. That rule provides—

When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

To adjourn.

To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourns it shall be to a day certain.

To take a recess.

To proceed to the consideration of executive business.

To lay on the table.

To postpone indefinitely.

To postpone to a day certain.

To commit.

To amend.

Those are the only motions that are in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator enlighten the Chair as to what motion, then, is pending?

Mr. POINDEXTER. As I understand, the question is upon the amendment reported by the committee to the naval appropriation bill. Also, Mr. President, I will ask the Chair to consider Rule XXVI, which I have called to the Chair's attention.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The tendency of any bill is a question, but surely that does not prevent a motion to proceed to the consideration of some other bill. The suggestion of the Senator, however, that this report has only been made to-day and must lie over until to-morrow seems to be conclusive.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will settle, first, the point of order made by the Senator from Washington, if the Senator from South Carolina will pardon the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The Chair ruled a moment ago that the question of the reference of the joint resolution was now the pending question. If that be true, I should like to have a vote taken on its reference, as to whether it shall be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct in that the Chair held that; but the Chair meant—the Chair was unfortunate in expression—that when the question of reference properly came before the Senate and the Senator got unanimous consent, it would be in order at that time; but the Chair is impressed with the strength and force of the point of order made by the Senator from Washington under paragraph 2 of Rule XXVI—

Mr. KING. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a moment. The Chair is informed that the bill which the Senator from New Mexico has moved to take up was reported to-day, and the rule requires all reports of committees to lie over one day for consideration.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I desire to say that I think the ruling of the Chair is correct; so I withhold my motion for to-night; but I give notice now that on to-morrow I shall make the motion to take up for consideration House bill No. 14157.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Now, Mr. President, the motion with reference to the joint resolution, I understand, is in order.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I make the point of order against taking up that question. The question before the Senate is the amendment to the naval appropriation bill, and it has not been displaced either by unanimous consent or by a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The record will disclose better than the Chair's memory as to whether or not unanimous consent was granted for more than the reading of the joint resolution. Its introduction does not necessarily carry a reference. Unanimous consent, in the opinion of the Chair, was granted for its introduction, but that does not necessarily ipso facto carry with it a reference.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. KING. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will kindly state it.

Mr. KING. If a resolution has been offered of the character of that offered by the Senator from South Carolina and it has been read, assume that it lies on the table, may it not, when any Senator gets the floor, upon his motion, be referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unquestionably, were it not for the way in which the unanimous consent was expressed.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, just to bring the matter to an issue, I will ask the Senator from Washington to allow a vote to be taken on the question of the reference. I think we will save time by it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I understand, of course, the implication of the Senator's remarks; but, whatever the result may be, it is impossible for me to sacrifice the opportunity for the consideration of the appropriation bill upon any such intimation as that of the Senator from South Carolina. It is obvious that this motion will lead to debate; how much debate, no person can tell. If that motion can be considered, any other similar motion can be considered, and it will be impossible to proceed with the appropriation bill.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do not think it will lead to any debate. I think the question could be voted upon in a few moments, because this is a matter that is simply one of reference. I understand the object of the Senator from New Hampshire, perhaps, in asking that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have introduced this joint resolution in good faith, and I have consulted Senators on the

other side and on this side, and I have found not one that I had time to consult that was opposed to the general principle of the joint resolution.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, again I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senate is considering the naval appropriation bill. That bill can not be swept off the floor by motions made by Senators to refer to a committee some resolution unanimous consent, of course that interrupted the proceedings and his unanimous-consent request was denied, and that was the end of his joint resolution. It never was introduced, and there is no question on its reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will read, at the top of page 18, Rule XIV, clause 1:

Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for one day.

The Chair holds that the joint resolution is before the Senate, and has been introduced, but not referred, and may not be referred at this time, owing to the objection.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It was out of order to introduce it except by unanimous consent, and the Senator did not ask unanimous consent.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a moment, please. Possibly that is true; but the Senator, in the Chair's opinion, obtained unanimous consent to introduce it but not to have it referred.

Mr. HEFLIN. I submit that the Chair is correct. It was not necessary to say, "I am going to introduce a joint resolution." When the Senator said, "I want to consider it without reference," it means the same thing, and it has been read and is now the property of the Senate; but in order that we may go into the matter thoroughly and that everybody may understand it, I suggest the absence of a quorum, to save time.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has suggested the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	McKellar	Smith, S. C.
Ball	Hale	McNary	Smoot
Borah	Hefflin	Moses	Spencer
Brandegee	Hitchcock	New	Sterling
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sutherland
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Townsend
Curtis	Kenyon	Owen	Trammell
Dial	Keyes	Phipps	Underwood
Dillingham	King	Poinexter	Wadsworth
Elkins	Kirby	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Knox	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Gerry	Lenroot	Sheppard	Warren
Glass	Lodge	Simmons	Willis
Gooding	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, this matter could have been very easily settled. If the Senate thinks that the condition in which the farmers of this country are is not sufficiently serious to extend to them some particle of relief, or at least take cognizance of it by the passage of such a joint resolution as I have introduced, they could have referred it to a committee.

It is hardly proper for a Senator to intimate that a committee such as the Agricultural Committee did not understand the principles of banking and currency, particularly as it related to the agricultural interests of the country; that they did not have sufficient knowledge of that intricate business to pass upon a joint resolution involving some instructions to the board of governors whom we have intrusted with the enforcement of a law passed by this and the other body.

Mr. President, all that the joint resolution I have introduced is intended to accomplish is to direct the Federal Reserve Board to encourage renewals of loans based on safe agricultural paper. The cry is coming from every section of the country that the banks are calling for these matured loans. The markets have gone down so that to-day the products held by the farmers,

which cost them peak prices to produce, are now disastrously below the cost of production.

Suppose the banker, as good bankers are supposed to do—good from their viewpoint—forces the liquidation of the loans based on agricultural products—the farmers will not get enough to pay their fertilizer bills in the East, and not much more than enough to pay for the gathering of the crops in the Northwest and in the West. In that condition this joint resolution simply asks, instructs, and directs the Federal Reserve Board to allow the member banks and to encourage the member banks to renew these loans in order that the distressing conditions in which the farmers of the country find themselves may be relieved.

We have sent millions of dollars to the suffering ones of Europe. That was right and proper. I would have felt ashamed of my country had it not responded to the call of distress from abroad. But here we do not ask for an appropriation; we ask that special attention should be given to the basic industry of the country.

There is not a Senator here who does not recognize and realize, if he studies the problem at all, that the farmers of this country are not in a position to protect themselves against financial disaster. They have no reserve fund. They are not organized, as the great corporations are organized, so that from time to time during their prosperous years they can lay by a reserve fund for a season of disaster such as has now come upon them. They are unorganized, helpless, and defenseless before a storm such as this, and to-day they are standing with what little accumulations they have made swept away, and the Senate has gone on record to-night that it will not tolerate even a suggestion to the financial body we have created, and that we boasted was able to meet just this situation, to look into the terrible conditions now prevalent throughout the agricultural districts of the country, and direct them, not to extend a new loan, not to interfere with their rate of interest, but to allow and encourage a renewal of these loans, until the disastrous condition that is now confronting them, that was brought about by no act on the part of the farmers themselves, has passed. This body refuses even to allow the consideration of the joint resolution and its reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but remains here and continues working on a bill that proposes to appropriate out of the Treasury of the United States \$500,000,000 for the creation of battleships, and to put ourselves in a state of preparedness against some foreign foe.

I am not pretending to say that the provisions of the naval appropriation bill are not wise, but I do say that to-night there is a condition in this country fraught with more danger to us than the threatened encroachment of a foreign foe upon us.

Mr. President, I recognize the fact that a majority of the Senators in this body are not in sympathy with those who produce the food and the clothing of this Nation. I had hoped that the mere introduction of this joint resolution would have been a sufficient appeal to this body for its immediate passage. I was not surprised when the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] took occasion to object to the interference with the passage of the bill of which he has charge; but when the reference of this joint resolution to a committee where it might be strangled was seriously contemplated I was astonished. Is it possible that Senators to-night do not realize the condition in which this country now finds itself?

Planting time is here, and we have appropriated in the Agricultural appropriation bill \$5,000,000 for the purpose of buying seed to help certain farmers of the Northwest to seed their lands and to take a lien on the products of their fields for its repayment. The price of live stock has gone down to where livestock raisers are now sacrificing their product. It was reported to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that they were actually destroying their cattle and feeding the carcasses to hogs and saving the hides. Sheep are being butchered and fed to hogs. Horses are being destroyed and fed to hogs. The price of corn has gone down to a point where those who produce it stand face to face with financial ruin. The price of wheat is dropping every day. The price of cotton in the South has gone down to a point where it is lower than in the years preceding the war.

All this is because credit has been refused and the banks are calling for a liquidation of the loans, leaving the farmers helpless and defenseless. Yet the Senate votes the largest appropriations ever voted in the history of the country, and has not passed one single piece of legislation looking to the relief of those upon whom the prosperity of the country depends.

It is idle to say that the farmer is in the same category with other business men and must take his medicine. Every man knows that he is disorganized and financially unable to cope with the panic that has him now in its grip. What farmer or set of farmers in the country has ever named the price of a

single product produced of the staple crops? Who names the price of the farmer's wheat of the West? Who names the price of the farmer's cotton of the South? Who names the price of the farmer's cattle on the plains of the West? It is the men who sit about the tables in the stock and grain exchanges.

We have heard the emergency tariff bill discussed, and the question was whether we should put a tariff on the products of the farm. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] this afternoon called attention to the fact that we placed a tariff on manufactured products, and asked who was the first beneficiary of that protection. It was the owner of the plant, and it was left to his sweet will as to whether he would divide or give any of the benefits that accrued to him to the laborers about his plant.

The farmer to-day in the production of his crops has not the naming of the price of a pound of the staple crops or a bushel of any of the grain that he raises. We, in arranging our financial affairs, make it easy for the money changers and exchanges to get accommodation, and leave the great bulk of people, upon whom the prosperity of the country depends, at the mercy of those whose object it is to make a profit. But when we come to the toiling masses in the fields, those who produce the bread that we eat and the clothes that we wear, not a line nor a word has been written since we met in December until the present time that looks to any practical relief for that great body of our people who conduct the basic industry of the country.

There was actual opposition to the reinstatement of the War Finance Corporation. There was opposition to every measure that has been introduced here that looks to the direct and specific relief of those engaged in agriculture. We are appropriating millions upon millions of dollars for those things that are organized, for those who are in a position to help themselves, but not one line of legislation nor one dollar of appropriation to take care of those upon whom the welfare of the country rests.

When the Federal reserve act was passed it was the boast of the Democratic Party that we had created and brought into effect a law that would forever remove the possibility of a panic, and there are those who are going about the country now saying that we never were in a better position than we now find ourselves. If the condition in which the country now finds itself is not a panic, then I do not understand the meaning of the term.

Bankruptcy, ruin, failure, exist throughout the country, brought about by the restriction of credit and the unfortunate deflation of our currency. We have the report of the Comptroller of the Currency on the desks of Senators this morning making the showing that our gold reserve is above the requirement of the law; waiving certain requirements which are admissible by law, it is alleged that \$2,000,000,000 in addition to that already outstanding might be issued. Yet the people are impoverished, driven into ruin, because they can not get sufficient loans to meet the pressing obligations that are upon them in the production of the crops, and their holdings of the year must be sacrificed.

Mr. President, I have introduced the joint resolution in good faith. A similar resolution passed the Senate once before, and yet, in spite of the fact that every Senator must know and realize the condition in which the country is to-day from an agricultural standpoint, we will not even say that we are willing to have all the loans that are now existent extended until there can be some legislation passed that may relieve the situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. HEFLIN. If the Senator will pardon me, his joint resolution says good farm paper, and the banks are to be the judges as to whether it is good or not. It does not direct them to extend loans on paper that is not good, but only on paper that in the judgment of sound banking is good.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I drafted the joint resolution hurriedly this afternoon because there had come to me, not from my section of the country alone, but from every section of the country, letters and telegrams depicting a condition that is simply a reflection on the Senate and on the Congress. Men are forced into poverty, forced into ruin, while the banks of the country have on hand more money than ever before in the history of the country.

This condition is the natural and logical result of the unfortunate position taken by certain men in authority. I recognize the fact that during the war prices were inflated, but I also recognize the fact that whereas before the war we had less than a billion dollars of outstanding bonded indebtedness, after the war we had \$26,000,000,000 of indebtedness. The Government has issued its obligations to its people and those who own the bonds to the extent of practically \$26,000,000,000. That is one form of currency, or it was promised to be. It at least is the obligation that the Government must meet and liquidate.

The only way that we will deflate the real outstanding obligations and the currency of the country is in the liquidation of its obligations. How are we going to liquidate those vast obligations outstanding on the part of the Government except by taxation and the retirement of the bonds purchased in the open market or by the redemption of them at maturity?

We have gone at this thing from the wrong angle. Had there been encouragement of production, had prices been left to the law of supply and demand, the income taxes of the country would not have shrunk to the miserable proportions that they are to-day, with the excess profits practically swept out of existence, and yet the obligation of the Government remaining the same. Her ability through her people to meet it has been cut fourfold. How are we to meet the obligations of the Government through the form of taxation, the only way we may meet them, unless the people are able to meet the burden of taxation?

Are we going to meet them by impoverishing the cotton growers of the South, the wheat and cattle raisers of the West, to the point where they will quit the fields, and flock to the towns; or are we going to meet them by encouraging production in the great fields, forests, and mines of the country at a profit, and then out of the profit secure our taxes?

Land values and commodity values have shrunk to a fourth of the former figures, and not one dollar of our indebtedness has been liquidated. Our ability to meet the obligations of the Government in the form of bonds is \$18,000,000,000 less, according to the statement of the Comptroller of the Currency, than it was a year ago. What is the proper attitude of those of us charged with the legislative affairs of the Government? It is to see to it that the sources of revenue shall be encouraged. Will we encourage it by breaking the markets of the country, making serfs and peons out of those who produce the raw material that goes into our factories, or will we do it by encouraging the production of an abundant supply and giving to the man who produces the raw material a profit and a hope in the future?

In less than three years from the cessation of the war we have come to the point of an indebtedness surpassing any the country ever dreamed of. I have already alluded to the great shrinkage in the Nation's resources. Cotton has shrunk, wheat has shrunk, cattle have shrunk, in value and in price, the farmers are demoralized, credit is demoralized, and yet the interest on bonds is going on. From whom are we going to get the money with which to meet these obligations? From what source are we going to get it? Our excess-profits tax will amount practically to nothing. Our income tax has shrunk more than half.

Then, the burden of taxation falls where? From what source are you to get it? With factories running half time, farmers demoralized, business at a standstill, and the people quaking with the fear that always comes when hope is deferred, here, when a joint resolution is introduced directing the financial power of the Government to grant relief to those who must of necessity be the very basis of our prosperity, the Senate takes it as a huge joke. Who is the farmer? Why should he be considered? Why should we accede to the desires of those who desire a big Army and a big Navy and grant instant relief to every conceivable business except the man upon whom in the ultimate analysis the whole welfare of the country rests?

Mr. President, I propose before I am through with this joint resolution to put the Senate on record, if it be possible, as to what their attitude is toward granting some relief to those who to-night know not what to do, with the planting time of their crop on hand. I am advised that less than 12 per cent of the fertilizer used on the Atlantic seaboard from Maine to Florida has been sold, and this is the 1st of March. I am further advised that there is, perhaps, but one-half of the land that has heretofore been tilled which will be tilled this year, because of the lack of credit to plant and cultivate it. That condition is not restricted to my section alone; the same cry comes from every section of the country.

I want to tell the Senate here to-night that we are not dealing with the same class on the farm that we dealt with 12 years ago. The facilities for communication and transportation and education are so perfect to-day as compared with the same conditions on the farm in former years that the man in the country is as well informed as the man in the city, and though he is unorganized and is unable to defend himself from a financial standpoint, he has sense enough not to grow food and clothing and himself go barefoot and naked. If the city offers him a better opportunity for temporary relief from financial stringency, he will rush to the city, and that is what is being done now. Yet the United States Senate obstinately refuses

even to consider a measure which proposes to give direction to the body that we created that they shall allow and encourage the renewal of loans to those upon whom the destiny of the country depends.

RECESS.

Mr. POINDEXTER and Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I make a point of order that a motion to take a recess is not now in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is overruled. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HEFLIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum, if that is a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it is not. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 1, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28 (legislative day of February 24), 1921.

George Lawrence Bean, of New Hampshire, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Jack Senior, of New York, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

Raymond Pugh Eymann, of Ohio, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

Leo Cuthbert Dyke, of New York, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

Chester Howard Ober, of Rhode Island, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

George Clay Jones, of Oregon, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

Charles Shaw, of Massachusetts, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

Carl Alexander Egner, of Indiana, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

Leroy Preston Raynor, of New York, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

Lyman Davis Graham, of Pennsylvania, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

Max Orville Witherbee, of Colorado, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

Payson Austin Perrin, of Massachusetts, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

Roland Drew Horne, of Massachusetts, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

Benjamin Haines Rigg, of New Jersey, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy.

Oliver Scott Reading, of Illinois, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy.

Charles Keith Green, of California, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

Charles Justus Itter, jr., of Pennsylvania, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy.

SUPERVISING INSPECTOR STEAMBOAT-INSPECTION SERVICE.

William J. Maedonald, of Michigan, to be supervising inspector for the fourth district in the Steamboat-Inspection Service.

COAST GUARD.

Martin W. Rasmussen to be district superintendent in the Coast Guard of the United States, to take effect from September 9, 1920, to fill an existing vacancy.

Ralph T. Crowley to be district superintendent in the Coast Guard of the United States, to take effect from September 10, 1920, to fill an existing vacancy.

Cadet Noble G. Ricketts, to be an ensign in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from October 13, 1920.

Cadet Paul K. Perry to be an ensign in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from October 11, 1920.

Cadet Arthur G. Hall to be an ensign in the Coast Guard of the United States to rank as such from October 11, 1920.

Cadet Irving W. Buckalew to be an ensign in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from October 7, 1920.

Cadet Harold G. Bradbury to be an ensign in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from October 12, 1920.

Cadet Ephraim Zoole to be an ensign in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from October 8, 1920.

Cadet Merlin O'Neill to be an ensign in the Coast Guard of the United States, to take effect from date of oath.

Cadet Carleton T. Smith to be an ensign in the Coast Guard of the United States, to take effect from date of oath.

Cadet Norman H. Leslie to be an ensign in the Coast Guard of the United States, to take effect from date of oath.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

Maj. Henry Holden Sheen, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1916.

Maj. Joseph Edward Barzynski, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Laurence Oldham Mathews, Infantry, October 29, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Laurence Wilfred Redington, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Lee W. Card, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Harry Pforzheimer, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Louie Arnold Beard, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

First Lieut. Thomas Grafton Hanson, jr., Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 5, 1917.

First Lieut. Martin Owen Cahill, Field Artillery, October 15, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Wilbur Storm Elliott, Infantry, with rank from August 9, 1917.

Second Lieut. Engmann August Andersen, Cavalry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Maj. Hermann Heinrich Zornig, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. John Adams Brooks, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 25, 1917.

First Lieut. Charlie Edward Hart, Cavalry, with rank from August 20, 1919.

First Lieut. Forrest Clifford Shaffer, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. Rudolph Francis Whitelegg, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. John Will Coffey, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. Jesse Andrew Rogers, jr., Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

SIGNAL CORPS.

Lieut. Col. George Ernest Kumpke, Infantry, October 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Stanley Livingston James, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE.

Maj. Adelno Gibson, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Patrick Francis Powers, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Col. Charles Henry Hilton, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Stewart Oscar Elting, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Joseph Honore Rousseau, jr., Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Edward Carl Engelhart, Cavalry, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

Second Lieut. Henry Stehman Hostetter, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Emmaet Crawford Morton, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

AIR SERVICE.

First Lieut. Edgar Peter Sorensen, Coast Artillery Corps, October 20, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
 Second Lieut. William Joseph Flood, Infantry, October 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

FIELD ARTILLERY.

Capt. Alfred John Betcher, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Clifford Barrington King, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 24, 1917.

First Lieut. Hiram Wendell Tarkington, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 21, 1919.

First Lieut. Wesley Collins Dever, Infantry, with rank from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. John Hamilton Wise, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

CAVALRY.

Second Lieut. John William Wofford, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

INFANTRY.

Capt. Leon Ewart Savage, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

To be colonel with rank from February 11, 1921.

Lieut. Col. John Lesesue DeWitt, Infantry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from February 8, 1921.

Maj. Leo Asa Dewey, Infantry.

To be captains with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Charles Challice, jr., Quartermaster Corps.

First Lieut. Loyal Moyer Haynes, Field Artillery.

First Lieut. Cecil John Gridley, Infantry.

First Lieut. Clyde Lloyd Hyssong, Infantry.

First Lieut. Ernest Frederick Apeldorn, jr., Cavalry.

First Lieut. Donald Parker Spalding, Infantry.

First Lieut. William Donald Tabor, Cavalry.

First Lieut. Cornelius Edward Ryan, Infantry.

First Lieut. William Henry Crampton, Infantry.

First Lieut. Irvin Henry Zeff, Cavalry.

First Lieut. John Henry Ringe, Infantry.

First Lieut. William H. Killian, Cavalry.

To be first lieutenants with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Samuel Wilber Stephens, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Richard Cohron Lowry, Coast Artillery Corps.

Second Lieut. Albert Edgar Billing, Infantry.

Second Lieut. George Richard Thompson, Quartermaster Corps.

Second Lieut. Jess Garnett Boykin, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Charles Moorman Hurt, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. James Dallace Bender, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Ellis Bates, Infantry.

Second Lieut. George Pryor Johnson, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Clyde Virginius Finter, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Michael Cardon Shea, Field Artillery.

Second Lieut. Charles John Wynne, Quartermaster Corps.

Second Lieut. Holland Spencer Chamness, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Julian Horace George, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Walter Cortland Wagner, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Anderson Hassell Norton, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Hanford Nichols Lockwood, jr., Field Artillery.

Second Lieut. John Markham Ferguson, Infantry.

Second Lieut. John Calvin Sandlin, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Leslie Eugene Bowman, Quartermaster Corps.

Second Lieut. Horace Benjamin Smith, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Joseph Addison Dubois, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Barlow Winston, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Maurice Rose, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Chester Morse Willingham, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Gene Russell Mauger, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Frank L. Burns, Infantry.

Second Lieut. William Burl Johnson, Quartermaster Corps.

Second Lieut. Winfield Rose McKay, Infantry.

Second Lieut. James Bernays Lowrey, Infantry.

Second Lieut. James Harrison Donahue, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Thomas Patrick Walsh, Coast Artillery Corps.

Second Lieut. Warren Benedict Scanlon, Infantry.

Second Lieut. William Robert Hamby, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Buckner Miller Creel, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Ralph Andrew Eller, Field Artillery.

Second Lieut. Theodore Ernest Voigt, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Douglas Johnston, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Lawrence Pradere Hickey, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Severn Teackle Wallis, jr., Field Artillery.

Second Lieut. Charles Murray Rees, Infantry.

Second Lieut. William May, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Chester Wright Gates, Quartermaster Corps.

Second Lieut. Harold Herbert Fisher, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Silas Warren Robertson, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Donald Van Niman Bonnett, Infantry.

Second Lieut. William Henry Johnson, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Wiley Hubbard O'Mohundro, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Edmund Graham West, Quartermaster Corps.

Second Lieut. Ranald Trevor Adams, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Roger Shaw McCullough, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Robert Oliver White, Quartermaster Corps.

Second Lieut. Charles William Dietz, Quartermaster Corps.

Second Lieut. Samuel Howes Baker, Quartermaster Corps.

Second Lieut. John Parr Temple, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Timothy Sapia Bosch, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Juan Luis Oliver, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Eduardo Andino, Infantry.

Second Lieut. William Joseph Flood, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Lynn Packard Vane, Coast Artillery Corps.

Second Lieut. Lewis Rinehart Pfoutz Reese, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Philip Gilstrap Bruton, Corps of Engineers.

Second Lieut. Horace Leland Porter, Corps of Engineers.

Second Lieut. Carl Gilbert Holmes, Field Artillery.

Second Lieut. Edwin Forrest Carey, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Elmer Warren Miller, Coast Artillery Corps.

Second Lieut. Guy Malcolm Kinman, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Linton Yates Hartman, Coast Artillery Corps.

Second Lieut. Peter LeToney, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Robert Louis Renth, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Joseph Cuthbert Dolan, Field Artillery.

Second Lieut. Abraham Lincoln Bullard, Coast Artillery Corps.

Second Lieut. William Lincoln Hamilton, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Oscar Norvell Barney, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Thomas Florence McCarthy, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Roy Henry Speck, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Charles Augustus Reif, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Arthur Kay Ladd, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Charles Stevenson Denny, Coast Artillery Corps.

Second Lieut. Otto Montrose Low, Quartermaster Corps.

Second Lieut. Benjamin Arthur Thomas, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Joseph Kenneth Creamer, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Leonard Eby Lilley, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Glenn Earl Carothers, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Frank Thomas Madigan, Infantry.

Second Lieut. John Hilliard Healy, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. David Francis Finnerty, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Edward Clay Atkinson, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Lloyd Nelson Winters, Infantry.

Second Lieut. William Windom Dixon, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Christian Stephen Andersen, Coast Artillery Corps.

Second Lieut. Clarence Beaver Lober, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Everett Dudley Yerby, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Ralph Jacob Mitchell, Coast Artillery Corps.

Second Lieut. Russell Raymond Louden, Infantry.

Second Lieut. George Ferdinand Stutsman, jr., Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Frank Potter Albrook, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Arthur John Melanson, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Theodore Joseph Koenig, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Lemiel Lafayette Reece, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Willis Lamar Claxton, Coast Artillery Corps.

Second Lieut. Grandison Gardner, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Benners Brasfield Vail, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Walter Bingham Cochran, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Omer Osmer Niergarth, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Roy Alphonso Carter, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Pearne Clark Wilders, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Charles W. Fake, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Clifford Durward Overfelt, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Roderick Norman Ott, Air Service.

Second Lieut. George Van Studdiford, Infantry.

Second Lieut. William Byron Walters, Coast Artillery Corps.

Second Lieut. John Blaney, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Leland Fries Strader, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Percy Waldo Seymour, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Garland Thomas Rowland, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Lee Caraway Bizzell, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Marion Milton Pharr, Field Artillery.

Second Lieut. Walter Lee Sherfey, Infantry.

Second Lieut. James Victor Gagne, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. James Courtney Browne, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. John Boardman Lord, Field Artillery.

Second Lieut. Polk Johnson Atkinson, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Frank Norman Mallory, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Edmund Rucks Shugart, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Ulmont William Holly, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Rex Henry Burger, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Clarence Turner Davis, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Frank Rate Williams, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Harvey John Thornton, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Harold Joseph LaCroix, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Phillip Donnovin, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Andre Leonard Violante, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Leighton Nicol Smith, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Louis Urgel Labine, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Barmore Sharp, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Marcus Ellis Jones, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Harold Patrick Hennessey, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Victor Emerson Biehn, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Robert Robinson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Aubrey Hornsby, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Lawrence Lofton Cobb, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Havelly McKee, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Garnett Hamilton Wilson, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Francis Xavier Oberst, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Edwin Moore Burnett, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Richard Hawley Slider, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Andrew Edward Forsyth, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Justus Smith Davidson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Mark Histan Doty, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Charles Peter Prime, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Otto Rudolph Stillinger, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Chauncey Whitney Sampson, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Hugh Gibson Culton, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Paul Allen Reichle, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Hubert Taylor Sutton, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Gerald Bradford Devore, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Wallis Ammi Frederick, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Emerson Bush, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Edward Raymond Golden, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Herbert Joseph McChrystal, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Aubrey Casey Strickland, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Christopher Sinclair, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. James Harry Newberry, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. John Max Lentz, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. William Young McBurney, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Vincent Douglas Mee, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Charles Weiss Hanna, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Lawrence Kay, jr., Infantry.
 Second Lieut. James Willard Harris, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Albert Edgar Cannon, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Harry Marten Schwarze, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Philip Wallace Ricamore, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Benjamin Kenney Erdman, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Geoffrey Cooke Bunting, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Orin Lee Davidson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. James Patrick Boland, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Francis Hickey, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Emmett Michael Connor, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. John Joseph Dunn, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Clyde Hurschale Phillips, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Edward Albert Kimball, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Thomas James Chrisman, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Benjamin Harrison Graban, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Louis North Eller, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. George Stainback Deaderick, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Ashley Chadbourne McKinley, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Fred Charles Dierstein, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. John William Irwin, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Robert LeRoy Nesbit, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Lawrence Haley Caruthers, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Elmer Dane Pangburn, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Thomas John Carroll, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Beveridge, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Michael Everett McHugo, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Edward Lewis Searl, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Lloyd H. Duffin, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Vincent James Meloy, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles Egbert Branshaw, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Leigh Wade, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Earle Hayden Tonkin, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Ivan Leon Foster, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. John Robert Hall, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Ignatius Sullivan, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Edward Whiting Raley, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Dache McClain Reeves, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Oliver Perry Gothlin, jr., Air Service.

Second Lieut. Mark Henry Redman, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Wallace Marmaduke Allison, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Oscar George Fegan, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Jefferson Davis, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Harvey William Prosser, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Eugene Robert Cowles, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. John Francis Aleure, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Robert Victor Ignico, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Rutledge Maurice Lawson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Jacob Marcellus Woodward, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harry George Rennagel, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Dudley Hamilton Woodin, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Leland Ross Hewitt, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Frederick William Evans, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Oliver Edward Cound, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Frank La Rue, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Alfred Baxter Baker, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Fred Cyrus Nelson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Delbert Emerick Jones, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles Douglas, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Hugh Albert Bivins, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Clyde Antone Kuntz, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Elmer John Bowling, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Orin Jay Bushey, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Robert Shirley Clayton, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. John William Beck, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Robert Strong Worthington, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Louis Philip Moriarty, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. George Washington Polk, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles Norton Monteith, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Cleveland William McDermott, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. George Howell Burgess, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Vincent Hynes, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Frederick William Niedermeyer, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Graddon Taylor, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Leland Wilbur Miller, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William De Voe Coney, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Elbert Wiley Franklin, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Raphael Baez, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Robert Halbert Finley, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Clarence Herbert Welch, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Alfred Jefferson Lyon, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harold Lyman Clark, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Montrose Graham Thomson Neely, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Sam Love Ellis, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. George Godfrey Lundberg, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Eugene Lowry Eubank, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Howard Dutton Norris, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Frank Martyn Paul, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Samuel Martin Connell, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Edwin Upston, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Reuben Curtis Moffat, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Paul Langdon Williams, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Aloysius Hoy, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Theodore Julius Lindorff, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. William Alexander Marsh, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. George Thomas Barnes, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Samuel Custer Eaton, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Joseph John Gulkowski, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Charles Albert Welcker, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Francis Binford, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Harry Wesley Bauer, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Horace Landrum, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. George Roland McElroy, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Garrett Bruce Shomber, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. John Redmond Thornton, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Bayard Johnson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Mortimer Francis Sullivan, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Eggleston Wesley Peach, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. George Lawrence Potter, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Leslie Dillon Carter, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Don Riley, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Pembroke Augustine Brawner, jr., Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Isaac Leonard Kitts, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Fred Charles Thomas, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Harold Lewis Turner, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Merrill Deitz Mann, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Ezra Rice Frost, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Maurice Sheftad Hill, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Edgar Andrew Liebhauser, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles Lester Morse, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Albert Carl Foulk, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Edward Vincent Harbeck, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Frank Walter Seifert, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Austin Murray Coates, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Edward Ernest Hildreth, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Courtney Whitney, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Phillips Melville, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Gordon Williams, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Kenneth Gatiss Fraser, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William Colb Morris, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. George William Pardy, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Bernard Scott Thompson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Willis Ratcliffe Taylor, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Robert Duane Knapp, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Louis Braswell Knight, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Howard Bratton, jr., Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. James Harold Doolittle, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Thomas Curry, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Burdette Mase Fitch, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. William Bettencourt Souza, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Marll James Plumb, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Alfred Lindeburg, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Alexis Wilson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Clements McMullen, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Ames Scriber Albro, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Milo McCune, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles McKinley Robinson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Sanderson Crawford, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles Yawkey Banfill, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Myron Ray Wood, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Isaac Jackson Williams, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Clarence Edward Shankle, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Donald Lloyd Bruner, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William Joseph Gainey, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Lloyd Chartley Blackburn, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Leslie Philip Arnold, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Edward Jenkins, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Audrey Baxter Ballard, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Gerald Edward Grimes, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Henry Gardner, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William Campbell Goldsborough, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Louis Ogden Davis, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. James Howard Smith, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Clarence Omer Bell, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Arthur Girard Hamilton, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles Mellis Myers, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Cyrus Quinton Shelton, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Edward Huffner Wood, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Emil Charles Kiel, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Silas Clearman Hyndshaw, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harold Lee George, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Lewis Allego Dayton, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Younger Arnold Pitts, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Howard Zabriskie Bogert, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Burnie Raymond Dallas, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Benjamin Franklin Griffin, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Ward Fisk Robinson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harry Albert Fudge, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Lyle Meredon Shields, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Harvey James Golightly, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Charles Hale Dowman, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Hayden Davies, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Lewis Andrus Day, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Solomon Bernard Ebert, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Claude Weaver Feagin, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Harry Anton Johnson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles William Walton, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Barney McKinney Giles, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Roy Travis McLamore, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Bernard Joseph Tooher, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Albert Francis Hegenberger, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Norman Reuben Wood, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Wendell Holzworth Brookley, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William Stephen Fitzpatrick, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Max Frank Schneider, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Donald Gardner Stitt, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Eugene Walter Lewis, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. James Brian Edmunds, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Oscar William Koch, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Reis Joseph Ryland, Signal Corps.
 Second Lieut. Harold Farnsworth Hubbell, Signal Corps.
 Second Lieut. Glenn Charles Salisbury, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harold Ralph Wells, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Malcolm Stoney Lawton, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Floyd Albert Lundell, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Jasper Kemper McDuffie, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Ross Corbett Kirkpatrick, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Mark Rhey Woodward, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Howard Knox Ramey, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Theodore Shafer Van Veghten, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Lionel H. Dunlap, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Russell Ralph Fox, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Stanley Smith, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harold Daniel Smith, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Albert Brill, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Charles Walter Hensey, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Henry Edward Wooldridge, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Marion Larimore Elliott, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Irwin Stuart Amberg, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Earle J. Carpenter, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Pratt Hodges, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Oakley George Kelly, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Welcome Bridges Elston, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Alexander Mollison, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harold Webster Beaton, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Talcott Proudman Smith, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Gilbert Shaw Graves, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Stewart Wellington Torney, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William Grayson Moore, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Lawrence Brownlee Savage, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Leland Stanford Andrews, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Edwin Thomas May, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Edgar Eugene Glenn, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Joe Jones Yeats, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Harold Arthur Daly, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. John Millan Pennewill, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William Henry Buechner, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. John William Monahan, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Ernest Emery Harmon, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Cortlandt Spencer Johnson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harold Bentsch Rivers, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Henry Walter Ulmo, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Charles Carl Chauncey, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Walter Eugene Richards, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Ellsworth Adams, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Robert Elmer Self, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Roy Bradford Mosher, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Frederick Eugene Coyne, jr., Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. John Myers McCulloch, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Richard Kemp LeBrou, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles Wesley Sullivan, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Luther Earl Keithly, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Paul Harter Leech, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. George William Haskins, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Ernest Arthur DeWitt, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Albert Henry Johnson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Neal Dow Franklin, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Louis Joseph Harant, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Simmons Sullivan, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Eugene Cooper Batten, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Henry Joachim Boettcher, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Lonnie Otis Field, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Stanley Mitchell Ames, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Melvin B. Asp, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Royal Beard Lea, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Maurice Stewart Kerr, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. George Clement McDonald, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Peter Emanuel Skanse, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Alfred Evans Waller, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Clarence Roscoe MacIver, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harold Amos Moore, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Malcolm Nebeker Stewart, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John William Benton, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John George Shannonhouse, Chemical Warfare Service.
 Second Lieut. Odas Moon, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Dean Bryan Belt, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Arthur George Liggett, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Westside Torkel Larson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Andrew Daniel Hopping, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Newton Longfellow, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Fred Evans Woodward, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Lloyd Barnett, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Arthur Laird, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Bushrod Hoppin, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles William Stehmetz, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Owen Evans Spruance, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Myrddin Davies, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William Norris White, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Reuben Dallam Biggs, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Wendell Brown McCoy, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Francis Warren Nunenmacher, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Laurence Claude, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Augustus Barksdale, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Laurence Delmore, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Harold Franklyn Rouse, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Lonnie Gilbert, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harold Arthur Bartron, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Douglas Givens, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Benjamin Shields Catlin, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harold DeLancey Stetson, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. William Cushman Farnum, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles Milton Cummings, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Robert Grant Thorp, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Harold Kirkham Hine, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Williams Benson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Frederick Dan Lynch, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Atwater Woodruff, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Robert Wallace Burke, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Lester James Maitland, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Lee Shea, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Sterling Knox Harrod, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Earle Henry Manzelman, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William Warren Welsh, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Arthur Ignatius Ennis, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Paul Duane Casey, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. LeRoy William Yarrow, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Orville Ervin Davis, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. John Thomas McKay, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Percival Adams Wakeman, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Hyman Jackson Crigger, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Floyd Thomas Gillespie, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Hal C. Bush, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Henry Speidel, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Herbert Linus Berry, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Robert Owen Montgomery, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Horace Napoleon Gibson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Sidney Frank Wharton, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. David Marsh Todd, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Dayton Locke Robinson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Arvid Edward Maurice Fogelberg, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. James Yancey LeGette, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Howard Samuel Paddock, Signal Corps.
 Second Lieut. William Thomas O'Reilly, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. James Bryan McDavid, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Henry Elmer Sowell, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. James Webb Newberry, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. John Frederick Whiteley, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Edward Clay Johnson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Grissom Edward Haynes, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Guy Lewis McNeil, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Lebbeus Carman, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Landon Johnson Lockett, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Charles Henry Calais, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Oscar Lee Ansley, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Thomas Johnson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Clarence Prescott Talbot, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Graham Percy Brotherson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Charles Deans Calley, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Alfred Liljevalch Jewett, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Raymond Calvin Milyard, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Louie Clifford Mallory, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Bob Childs, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Lewis Selwyn Webster, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William Andrew Smith, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Roy William Camblin, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Ray Eric Cavenee, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Wade Darragh Killen, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Andrew Jackson Schriver, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Frank James Lawrence, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Day Jewell, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Dorrance Scott Roysdon, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Francis Joyce, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Maurice Eugene Knowles, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Hyatt Floyd Nevell, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Harry Mosby, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. John Easton McCammon, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Matthew Edward Finn, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Brandon Wright, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Albert Faltoute Hebbard, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Clarence Lee King, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Evers Abbey, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Henry Lee Kinnison, jr., Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Helmuth Ernst Beine, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Harold Frederick Greene, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Harrison Gage Crocker, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles Glendower Ellicott, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Chester Arthur Horne, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Harry Luther Coates, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Edmund Connolly, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Benjamin Buckles Cassidy, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Frank Lauderdale Cook, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Bernard Tobias Castor, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Homer Barron Chandler, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Carl Weston Pyle, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Edwin Morgan Pendleton, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Walter Thomas Meyer, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Valentine Stone Miner, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Myron Emmett O'Hanly, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harry Forest Collier, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles Homer Martin, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Willard Shaw Clark, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Homer B. Pettit, Corps of Engineers.
 Second Lieut. John Spalding Miller, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Stilwell Conrow, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Cornelius John Kenney, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Winfield Scott Hamlin, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Joseph McDonald, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Leo George Clarke, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Thaddeus Zak, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Alfred Gideon Anderson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Hugh Carlton Dorrien, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. James Carl Horne, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Werner Watson Moore, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Fremont Byron Hodson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Robert Theodore Zane, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Rudolph William Broedlow, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Marvin Clifton Bradley, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Albert Edmund Rothermich, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Stowe Thompson Sutton, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. James Ainsworth Brown, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Elliott Raymond Thorpe, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. John Carson Grable, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Oscar Douglas Sugg, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. LeRoy Allen Walthall, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Lucas Victor Beau, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Arthur Lee Shreve, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Daniel Edward Morgan, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Newman Ralford Laughinghouse, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Ambrose Victor Clinton, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William Jones Hanlon, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Harold McFall, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Hiram Wilson Sheridan, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Howard Arnold Craig, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. David Robert Stinson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Theodore Morris, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Carl Hiestand Myers, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Armor Simpson Hefley, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William Robert Sweeley, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Raymond Carl Zettel, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Carl Grammer Eliason, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. George Allan McHenry, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Oscar Harmon Harris, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Erling Schriver Norby, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Carlyle Howe Ridenour, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Carl Anson Cover, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Russell Carrigan MacDonald, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Bennett Edward Meyers, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Laurel Eugene Stone, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Robert Storie Heald, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Warren Arthur Maxwell, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Walter Hannum Carlisle, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. William H. Papenfoth, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Harry Leon Speck, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Frederick Mercer Hopkins, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Rupert Edison Starr, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. James Desmond Summers, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. George Edgar Rice, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Frank Edward White, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Lowell Whittier Bassett, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Dudley Ely Rowland, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Edward Michael Powers, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Maurice Edgar Jennings, Chemical Warfare Service.
 Second Lieut. Victor Emile Bertrandias, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Felix Marcus Alexander, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Everett Listeman Kirkpatrick, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William Burleigh Clarke, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Howell Harrell, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Paul Edmund Burrows, Air Service.

Second Lieut. George Harold Brown, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Elmer Daniel Perrin, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Wallace Robinson Fletcher, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Dale Vincent Gaffney, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Kennedy Matthews, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Kenneth Bonner Wolfe, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Stanley Powloski, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Harry Lincoln Calvin, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. William Tillmon Agee, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Fraser Richardson, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Clifford Irving Hunn, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Chester Howard Elmes, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. John Vernon Hart, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Richard Hartnett Magee, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles Simpson Carroll, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Henry Harold Reily, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Samuel DeWitt Tallmadge, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Donald Dakin Lamson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Augustus Dawson Sanders, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William James Wagenknight, jr., Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Cola Edgar Stone, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Mitchell Franklin Orr, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Edward Milan Taylor, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Dayton Dudley Watson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Herschel David Baker, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Herbert Edward Baker, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Donald David Fitzgerald, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Ulmont Ogden Cumming, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Standifer Gunby, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Andrew Paul Sullivan, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Austin Walrath Martenstein, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Edwin Barton Bobzien, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William Carl Gabriel, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John D. Corkille, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Henry Few Sessions, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. DuVal Crump Watkins, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Levi L. Beery, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Carlton Foster Bond, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Roland Lester Spencer, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Willis Clark Conover, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Morton McDonald Jones, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Robert MacKenzie Shaw, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. John DeForest Barker, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Albert Durnford, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Frank Griffin Marchman, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Francis Hugh Antony McKeon, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Edwin Johnson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Clifford Augustus Smith, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Warren Rice Carter, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Francis Sheehan, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Thad Victor Foster, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Bayard Haley, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Charles Eugene Schwarz, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Marshall Eugene Darby, Ordnance Department.
 Second Lieut. George Cocks Bland, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. John Cyrus Gates, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. James Flannery, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harold Alling McGinnis, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harry Arthur Halverson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles Theodore Skow, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Morton Howard McKinnon, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Nathan William Thomas, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Walter Bernard Hough, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Caviness Rickner, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Guy Clifton Benson, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. William Michael Lanagan, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. George Platt Tourtellot, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. George Hendricks Beverley, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harrison Jay Hartman, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Walter Kellsey Burgess, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Paul California Wilkins, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Gustavus Franzle Chapman, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Arthur Leslie Thornton, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Norman Delroy Brophy, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Raymond Morrison, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Alexander Pearson, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Rupert Julian, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Graham Mead St. John, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Wallace Gordon Smith, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles Adam Horn, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Ployer Peter Hill, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Clarence Chamberlin Wilson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Byron Elihu Gates, Air Service.

Second Lieut. Elmer Karl Pettibone, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Wendell Eugene Goodrich, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William Lewis Boyd, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Leon Edgar Sharon, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Houston McWilliams, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. James Ferris Morison, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Oscar Monthan, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Ivan Lewis Proctor, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Matthew Ebbert Webber, Chemical Warfare Service.
 Second Lieut. Wilfred Morey Clare, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Delmar Hall Danton, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Hjalmar Frithjof Carlson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Orvil Arson Anderson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Emile Tisdale Kennedy, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Edwin Virgin, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles Reed Evans, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Hugh Chester Downey, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Joseph Powers, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. George William Goddard, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Jack Greer, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Guy Kirksey, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Herbert Chapman, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Robert Franklin Jones, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Harry Hobson Mills, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Luther Walecka, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Angler Hobbs Foster, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Edwin Sullivan, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Carroll Ray Hutchins, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. John Raymond Drumm, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Oliver Kendall Robbins, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William Joseph White, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Fidells Connell, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Faye Sherman Gullet, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Raglan Glascock, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. George Vardeman McPike, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Ray L. Owens, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Henry Leonard Kersh, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Lloyd Russell Garrison, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Charles Gage Brenneman, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Reuben Castor, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Leland Hudson Barnes, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Clarence Richard Sutherland, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Raymond George Miller, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Clyde Milton Hallam, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Nicolas Fosdick Galbraith, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. William A. Enos, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Richard Royall Baker, jr., Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Norman Joseph Eckert, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Hugh Cort, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Benjamin Rhoten Morton, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Samuel Oliver Carter, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Jasper Ewing Brady, jr., Infantry.
 Second Lieut. George Good Cressey, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Orville L. Stephens, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Clarence Edgar Crumrine, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Albert Wyatt, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. George William Snow, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Morris Langdon Tucker, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. William King Moran, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Corley Perry McDarment, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Russell Hay Cooper, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Gaylord Leon Phipps, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Henry Guy Woodward, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Clifford James Moore, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. John Ross Morgan, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Pittman Wall Mills, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Robert Dudley Moor, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Roscoe Caleb Wriston, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Charles Edwin Thomas, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Fredrick Andrew Johnson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Henry William Brandhorst, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Leonard Roberts Smith, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Stanley Noble Partridge, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. John Bigham Crandell, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. James Bumer Jordan, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Albin Nace Caldwell, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Arvel Joshua Monger, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. John Hamilton Judd, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Jefferson Ford, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Charles Richardson Smith, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Walter Franklin Graham, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Raymond Edward Shum, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Charles Vernon Barnum, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Kenton Parkes Cooley, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Lester Erasmus Gruber, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Frederick William Wennerberg, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Alfred Nelson Taylor, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William John Hardy, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Jack Edmund Rycroft, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Harold David Porter, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Ben Robert Jacobs, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Mark Christian Neff, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Henry Foster, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Lewis Dabney Hixson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Clyde Girard Banks, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Lyle Sayers Lindsey, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Ivan Downes Yeaton, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Everett Winstead, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Harry Cullins, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Alfred Edwin McKenney, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Henry Bosard Ellison, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Robert Don McKnight, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Joe Arthur Hinton, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Paul Hayes, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Earl Monroe Miner, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Eugene Lemuel Miller, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Reuben Ellis Jenkins, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Patrick Francis Powers, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Howard E. Purilliam, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Millard Fillmore Willet Oliver, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Arthur Lowell Johnson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Alfred Northam, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. James Robert Manees, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Roland Samuel Henderson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. James Cecilus White, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Norman Drysdale Gillet, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Jack Clemens Hodgson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Keifer Behler, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Victor Walter Smith, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Robert Clay Beckett, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Carlisle Clyde Dusenbury, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. James Leland Bolt, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. George Andrew Glover, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. John A. Kase, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Theodore Thomas Teague, Signal Corps.
 Second Lieut. Russell Calvert Worthington, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Clifford Elleman, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Eugene Vincent Elder, Signal Corps.
 Second Lieut. Carter Weldon Clarke, Signal Corps.
 Second Lieut. Ralph Gordon Richards, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Paul LaRue Neal, Signal Corps.
 Second Lieut. Ray Guy Harris, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Wallace Caldwell Cummings, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Cole Shively, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Clifford Smith, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Karl Derby Guenther, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Francis Harold Vanderwerker, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. James Culver Cluck, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Stacy C. Hinkle, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Richard Geter Rogers, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Felix Routhier, Finance Department.
 Second Lieut. Robert Taylor Strode, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Harrison Ward, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Henry Beaumont Pennell Boody, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Charles Willard Getchell, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Julius Trousdale Berry, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Russell Dean Powell, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Charles Rudolph Carlson, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. William Clinton McCarthy, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Charles Herbert Day, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Oscar Foreman, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Harry Lee Watts, jr., Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Tonnes Dennison, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Harold Engerud, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Raymond Thomas Joseph Higgins, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Sidney Cushman Page, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. David Dick Caldwell, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Walter Talcott Wilsey, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Albert James Hastings, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Paul Ruthven Jones, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Seward Lincoln Mains, jr., Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Herbert Glendon Messer, Signal Corps.
 Second Lieut. Frederic Cooley Eveleth, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Edwin Karl Pohlson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Charles Kellogg McAlister, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Francis Keefe, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Edward Harold Metzger, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Clinton Steele Berrien, Field Artillery.

Second Lieut. Raymond Adelbert Knapp, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Courtland Moshier Brown, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Newman Hall Cherry, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Harold Hopkins Miller, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Walter Francis Resing, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Henry William Kunkel, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Keith Kirkman Tatom, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Harry Walter Killpack, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Paul Revere Taylor, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Noel Amis, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Thomas Falin, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Jack Joseph O'Connell, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Alva Edison McConnell, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Hez McClellan, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harold Hibbard Carr, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Alphonse Stoeckle, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Timothy Alexander McLellan, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. James Russell Brownell, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Carley Lawrence Marshall, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Fred Griffith Threatt, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Frank Daniel Huarte, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Hugh Tom Edwards, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Otho Burdette, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Harold Russell Jordan, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Charles Edgar Burchett, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Edward Moore Masterson, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. John Charles Brown, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Henderson Wilcox Allen, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Arthur Burton Clark, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Edwin Milton Bush, jr., Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. John Wesley Hill, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Frederick Brodie Forbes, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Augustus Weinberger, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Onie Ray Dilley, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Andrew Bruyette Mangum, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. William Ernest Donegan, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Herbert Sherman Nettleton, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Brooks, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Cyrus Bettis, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Rufus Benjamin Davidson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Stanley Milward Umstead, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Howard Carlton Brandt, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Roland Birnn, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Stanton Thomas Smith, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Stephen Edward Stancisko, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Edward Vincent Freeman, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Kenneth Garrett, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. James Joseph Langin, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Norman Crawford Caum, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Howard James Edmands, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Glenn Clinton Holcomb, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Earl Thomas McCullough, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Alexander Sinclair Reynolds, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Gerard Swarthout, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Allan Francis Sullivan, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Clarkson Huggins, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Walter Roane, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Herman Jaeger, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. James Alva Murphey, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Daniel Schas, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Robert Schaefer, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Moses Alexander, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. James Merrill Robinson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Kenneth Edgar Kline, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Donald Dewey McCaskey, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Allen Agee Goodwyn, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Ralph Elmer Alexander, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Frederick Reinhold Undritz, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Robert Howard Wylie, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Frank Wolle Stout, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Francis Emerson Charlton, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Charles Drysdale Simmonds, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Albert Pierson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Sylvian Gaston Kindall, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. John Hancock Holder, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Popenjoy Bailey, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John McDonough Early, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Otto Lucratius McDaniel, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Francis Pat Booker, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Theodore Lawson, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Kenneth Campbell McGregor, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Rafael Louis Salzmann, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Riley Finley Ennis, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Clarence Frost Horton, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Francis Paul Connelly, Finance Department.

Second Lieut. Oliver Allen Gottschalk, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harry Joseph Martin, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Lawrence Cornwallis Collins, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Hewitt Warren Richmond, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Porter Tate Gregory, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. James Hiram Bedford, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Ray Edward Dingeman, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Max Frederic Moyer, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Arthur Edmond Wilson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. George Cobb Wynne, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. George Franklin Nichols, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Spencer Hall, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Harry Frederick Meyers, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Oia Aloysius Nelson, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. Robert Lowry Freeman, Cavalry.
 Second Lieut. Harry Isaac Rosen, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. William Chauncey Hutt, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Arthur Nicholas Ziegler, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Robert Homer Soule, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Pardoe Martin, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. John Augustus Hunt, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Raymond Rudolph Brown, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. George Barnett Bloom, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Ernest Griffin, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Second Lieut. James Sharp Eldredge, Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Edwin Charles Lickman, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Patrick Collins, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Rudolph George Schmidt, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Harrison William Johnson, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Ralph Willerton French, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Corwin Lynn Rogers, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Elmer Monhollan, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Prentiss Pittman, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Clifton Tredway Hunt, Corps of Engineers.
 Second Lieut. Robert Scurlark Moore, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Aloysius Tagliabue, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Victor Otto Overcash, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. David Ray Nimocks, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Archie Bird Whitlow, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Thrower Fitts, jr., Infantry.
 Second Lieut. William Kennett McKittrick, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Fredrik Lorentsen Knudsen, jr., Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Jessie Thomas Harris, Infantry.
 Second Lieut. Raymond Nesbitt Hutto, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Crowell Edward Pease, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Claude Bertram Avera, Quartermaster Corps.
 Second Lieut. William John McKiernan, jr., Air Service.
 Second Lieut. Hobart Dewey Reed, Field Artillery.
 Second Lieut. Frederick Buchanan Rosenbaum, Infantry.

PROMOTIONS IN THE PHILIPPINE SCOUTS.

To be first lieutenants with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Herbert Lee Merritt, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Furmon Arthur Shults, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Harry W. Howard, Philippine Scouts.
 Second Lieut. Eustaquio Baclic y Sabio, Philippine Scouts.
 First Lieut. Thomas Luther Spoon, Dental Corps, from September 10, 1920.
 First Lieut. Earle Robbins, Dental Corps, from September 10, 1920.
 First Lieut. Roy Albert Stout, Dental Corps, from September 12, 1920.
 First Lieut. Oscar William Thompson, Dental Corps, from September 12, 1920.
 First Lieut. Howard Austin Hale, Dental Corps, from September 18, 1920.
 First Lieut. William Swann Shuttleworth, Dental Corps, from October 19, 1920.
 First Lieut. Milton Julius Damlos, Dental Corps, from September 10, 1920.
 First Lieut. Thomas Floyd Davis, Dental Corps, from February 4, 1921.

VETERINARY CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Earl Floyd Long, Veterinary Corps, from September 4, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Patrick Henry Hudgins, Veterinary Corps, from September 10, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Gerald Woodward FitzGerald, Veterinary Corps, from September 13, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Russell Samuel Shannon, Veterinary Corps, from September 17, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Eiriam Dornblaser, Veterinary Corps, from September 16, 1920.

Second Lieut. Peter Thomas Carpenter, Veterinary Corps, from September 22, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Samuel George Kielsmeier, Veterinary Corps, from September 22, 1920.

CHAPLAIN.

To be chaplain with the rank of captain.

Chaplain Adolf John Schliesser, from June 4, 1920.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate February 28 (legislative day of February 24), 1921.

Maj. John Baxter Sanford, Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel, with rank from July 1, 1920.
 First Lieut. Charles William Hagen, Infantry, to be captain, with rank from July 1, 1920.
 First Lieut. Ernest Frederick Apeldorn, jr., Infantry, to be captain, with rank from July 1, 1920.
 First Lieut. Irvin Henry Zeff, Field Artillery, to be captain, with rank from July 1, 1920.
 Chaplain Adolph John Schliesser to be chaplain, with the rank of captain, from June 4, 1920.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

Maj. Henry Holden Sheen, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
 Maj. Joseph Edward Barzynsky, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
 Maj. Laurence Oldham Mathews, Infantry, October 29, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
 Capt. Louis Arnold Beard, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
 First Lieut. Thomas Grafton Hanson, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 5, 1917.
 First Lieut. Martin Owen Cahill, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

Second Lieut. Henry Stephen Hostetter, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.
 Second Lieut. Emmett Crawford Morton, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Maj. Herman Heinrich Zornig, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
 Capt. John Adams Brooks, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 25, 1917.
 First Lieut. Charles Edward Hart, Cavalry, with rank from August 20, 1919.
 First Lieut. Forrest Clifford Shaffer, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1920.
 First Lieut. Rudolph Francis Whitelegg, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1920.

SIGNAL CORPS.

Lieut. Col. George Ernest Kumpe, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
 First Lieut. William Clarke Webster, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from January 28, 1919.

CAVALRY.

Second Lieut. John Williams Wofford, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

FIELD ARTILLERY.

Capt. Arthur John Betcher, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
 Capt. Clifford Barrington King, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 24, 1917.
 First Lieut. John Victor Anderson, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from December 19, 1918.
 First Lieut. Christopher Columbus Strawn, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from March 25, 1919.
 First Lieut. Hiram Wendall Turkington, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 21, 1919.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Maj. Stewart Oscar Eltinge, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Honoro Rousseau, jr., Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Edward Carl Englehart, Cavalry, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

AIR SERVICE.

First Lieut. Edgar Peter Sorenson, Coast Artillery Corps, October 20, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Joseph Flood, Infantry, October 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.